AN ESSAY

ON THE

HARMONIOUS RELATIONS

BETWEEN

Divine Faith and Natural Reason.

TO WHICH ARE ADDED

TWO CHAPTERS

ON THE

DIVINE OFFICE OF THE CHURCH.

BY A. C. BAINE, ESQ.

WITH THE APPROBATION OF THE
MOST REVEREND, THE ARCHBISHOP OF BALTIMORE.

BALTIMORE:
PUBLISHED BY JOHN MURPHY & CO.
SAN FRANCISCO...M. FLOOD.
LONDON...CATHOLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY.
SOLD BY ALL CATHOLIC BOOKSELLERS.
1861.

Property of
COSA
Please return to
Graduate Theological
Union Library

ENTERED, according to the act of Congress, in the year eighteen hundred and sixty, by JOHN MURPHY, in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of Maryland.

San Francisco, May 12, 1860.

Dear Gentlemen:

In transmitting to you the Essay of Judge A. C. Baine, for publication, I feel pleasure in stating that I consider the work very useful to the public. It is the offering of a convert—a respectable American citizen, and a distinguished member of the Bar—who feels for the spiritual interest of his fellow citizens, and who, having obtained the treasure of the true faith, sincerely desires that others may be equally blessed. Thus he devotes his logical mind to prove that the Catholic Church is, as she was, the Teacher, vested with God's commission, to impart Christian revelation. This is done in a style rather new, yet forcible—familiar, yet conclusive. The judge makes out the case of the Church, as in a Court of Justice, and he cannot fail obtaining from all impartial readers a favorable verdict.

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH S. ALEMANY,
Archbishop of San Francisco.

Messrs. John Murphy & Co.
Baltimore.

670

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/essayonharmoniou0000acba

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

PREFACE.

The object of this little volume is to show the Harmonious Relations between Divine Faith and Natural Reason: and thus establish that the Church, in teaching the divine revelation committed to the Apostles, usurps no province, restrains no legitimate operation, and violates no real sanction of either reason, common sense, or experience. As a sequence to this, it is the further design, or hope rather, of this work, to present the case in such a point of view, as to induce every candid and just-minded man to ascertain the faith which the Church teaches her children, from her own standards of faith, and not to take her teaching upon the declamatory traditions and historical assertions of her accusers. To this much of simple justice she, and all her children, think she is entitled from all men of whatever persuasion.

It is a principle of universal jurisprudence that no man, not even the most lowly culprit, shall be condemned unheard, no matter how fierce his accusers may be, and no matter how terrible the crimes they may lay to his charge. The judge who would condemn any man upon mere clamor, without any investigation into the actual conduct of the person accused, would be considered both cruel and unjust. And the Church feels most profoundly, and earnestly insists, that whoever denounces her teaching without learning from her own standards of faith exactly what she does teach as divine

faith, is at once unjust to her and to his own intellect and soul.

It has been the accusation of ages against the Church, that she usurps the provinces of reason, common sense, and experience in teaching divine faith to her children; and millions upon millions of men have accepted the accusation as true, without ever having seen one of her catechisms or any standard of her faith, written by one of her recognized teachers. Indeed, her accusers doom her to their hate without even consulting her theologians and historians, so that they are ignorant of both her faith and her theology. And I respectfully appeal to any who now condemn her, whether they do so because they have read and understood the teaching of her authorized doctors, or whether they do not do it upon the historical assertions of her enemies and their denunciations of her faith. It is, then, a purpose of this Essay to induce investigation into the very truths the Church actually teaches, and also, to take those who have adopted the traditions of her accusers, into the sanctuary of reason, and at the foot of the altar of reason, to inquire of that unbiassed oracle whether the accusations against the Church be true or not. And whoever will carefully, in a candid spirit of inquiry, read this little book, will find, as we devoutly trust, that the Church—so far from chaining reason down to abasement—teaches a faith entirely consistent with this noble faculty of our nature. We believe that he will be convinced that the faith the Church teaches her children is an extension of knowledge, and not an abolition of reason. If God did reveal a faith to be perpetually taught to man, it must follow that whoever will, earnestly and honestly, examine the real relations which exist between this di-

vinely revealed faith and human reason, will be irresistibly forced to the conclusion, that these relations are perfectly harmonious. This is a self-evident teaching of both faith and reason. And hence the truth of the accusation against the Church, that she either debases or annihilates reason in her teaching, necessarily depends upon a simple and most elementary *fact;* which is: Does she teach the very faith, the exact truth, which was deposited with her when she was organized and commanded to teach all nations forever? If she does, the charge that she teaches any thing *contrary* to reason, is—*must* be, entirely without foundation. But this elementary *fact* can never be ascertained by taking traditionary denunciation and historical clamor as true. It can only be ascertained by an unbiased investigation of her standards of faith, as taught by her recognized and lawfully consecrated teachers. And these so ascertained, reason, when rightly interrogated and truly interpreted, brings no charge against the Church of usurping her sovereignty and of subjugating her powers. On the contrary, she regards the Church as her divine assistant in all her struggles, and as her heaven-born guide into new realms of thought, and new kingdoms of extended knowledge and power, everywhere, in nature and super-nature, nurturing her strength, assuring her powers, chastening and purifying all her exertions; and as impressing infallibility upon her conclusions, in the things pertaining to divine revelation. This is the just and real relation which faith sustains towards natural reason; and the Church takes the utmost pains, and exerts a perpetual solicitude, to teach the sacred observance of this relation, in all its integrity, to her children. She claims to do this. Whether her

claim be founded in fact or not, can only be ascertained from an investigation of her OWN STANDARDS OF DOCTRINE. And whoever will, from these, ascertain what she does teach, instead of taking as true the traditions of accusation which her adversaries have perpetuated against her, will assuredly find the truth to be as it is now stated, touching the teaching of the Church, on the relation of divine faith to human reason.

To show the truth of this assertion and, thereby, to induce the investigation which is suggested, is the purpose of the following Essay. In its thoughts, no sentiment will be found inimical to the dignity and sovereignty of reason. That it speaks the language of the Church upon its subject, is seen by the recommendation of one of her learned and holy doctors, to whom I humbly dedicate the work.

THE AUTHOR.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

SECTION I.

In the Light of Reason, an Infallible Teacher a Necessity of a Divine Revelation 13

SECTION II.

The Example of the Bereans, or the Duty of Reason to inquire into the Grounds of the Faith of the Infallible Church 31

SECTION III.

Those who reject the Teaching of the Infallible Church, without a Careful Examination of its Standards of Faith, as the Bereans did the Teaching of St. Paul, do not use Reason, but submit to the Temper of the Thessalonians. Clamor and Persecution the sure Indicia of Prejudice and Non-investigation—but never the Criterion of Reason 53

SECTION IV.

The Antecedent Probability that if a Divine Revelation were made to be taught through all time, that an Order of Teachers would be consecrated to teach it with Infallible Certainty; or that a Divine Revelation commanded to be taught, would be taught in Accordance with the Will of the Revealer, and, therefore, Truly, and not Erroneously 73

SECTION V.

What did the Sacerdotal Order, the Apostles, teach? By what Authority? With what Intolerance to Innovation? and with what Rigorous Consistency, and, hence, Especial Exclusiveness? The Position of Natural Reason in Relation to the Teaching of the Sacerdotal Order 87

SECTION VI.

What is the Evidence of what the Sacerdotal Order taught, and the institutions the Apostles established? And how shall this Evidence be investigated? 105

SECTION VII.

The Province of Reason, and the Province of Faith 131

SECTION VIII.

Reason not the Standard or Rule of Divine Faith..... 151

SECTION IX.

Human Experience not the Standard or Rule of Divine Faith..... 169

SECTION X.

Common Sense not the Standard or Rule of Divine Faith..... 188

SECTION XI.

Pecuniary Prosperity and Material Power in Individuals and Nations not a Standard or Rule of Divine Faith .. 218

SECTION XII.

The Governments or Political Constitutions of States not the Standard or Rule of Divine Faith..... 240

SECTION XIII.

The Senses of Tasting, Smelling, Seeing, and Touching, not the Standards of Divine Faith; nor are they Essential or Material Elements entering into the Rule, and constituting its Substance and Validity: they are not Criteria of a Divine Revelation at all. Hearing, the Organ of Divine Faith 283

SECTION XIV.

The Question. The Question never is, What is Man's Reason, his Experience, his Common Sense, or his Tastes and Opinions? but it always is, What has God Revealed? The Supremacy of Faith in the Natural Order is taught by all our Natural Knowledge: but in the Supernatural Order, the Supremacy of Faith is a Matter of Necessity. Our Natural and Mental Constitutions give undoubted Testimony to these Propositions..... 315

APPENDIX.

INTRODUCTION 363

CHAPTER I.

The Infallibility of the Church in her Office of teaching Divine Revelation examined 365

CHAPTER II.

The Infallibility of the Church in her Office of teaching Divine Revelation. Objections considered. The Church is her own Witness. "The Vicious Circle," a Misstatement of the Question. It is First, Sinister; Secondly, Absurd; Thirdly, Necessarily Untrue. It is Unreasonable and Incredible..... 386

Divine Faith and Natural Reason.

SECTION I.

In the Light of Reason, an Infallible Teacher a Necessity of a Divine Revelation.

The relation which every human being sustains to the supernatural world, ought to be a subject of most earnest inquiry. It should excite the highest sentiments of duty, and the purest regard and holiest love for the obligations which that relation imposes upon the soul of man. That God, the Father of the spirit of man, which, in its birth and origin, he made innocent and holy, looks on this relation of humanity with supreme interest and regard, is evinced in all his dealings with our race. And in a most especial manner has he evinced it by his revelation of himself in his Son Jesus Christ, whose especial mission was to recall man from the dreadful and

ruinous errors into which he had, seemingly, irremediably fallen, and to replace him again in his true relation to his Creator. Hence, humanly speaking at least, the necessity of the divine revelation to man by Jesus Christ. And as this revelation was to be taught, by an order of teachers divinely consecrated, to all nations, to the end of the world, the necessity of an infallible teacher and teaching is as manifest and self-evident an instruction of reason, as the necessity of a divine revelation itself. For the very idea of a teacher of divine revelation implies, as inseparable from its nature and office, the idea of infallible authority, or security from error in the teacher. This is as plain a dictate of common sense, as it is the undoubted teaching of the Catholic Church. It cannot be a dictate of any just principle of the human mind, operating free from error, that Christ would reveal a system of faith, for the salvation of the human race, and yet at the same time commission a Church to teach error concerning the *facts* so revealed and commanded to be taught. Why was Christ conceived in the womb of a virgin by the overshadowing power of the Holy Ghost, —why did he assume his sacred humanity, die on the cross—promise the Holy Ghost to his Church, and signally fulfil the promise on the

day of Pentecost? To reveal infallible truth, in an enduring and everlasting form. It cannot be that the grandest and most inexplicable mysteries were revealed in order to propagate error, or indifferent and non-essential truths.

The capacities of the human mind had become so enfeebled, by the original disobedience and the accumulations of error consequent upon the primal crime, that it could not have sustained, or even have embraced, revealed truth without supernatural aid. The state of man hence demanded a revelation of infallible truth, which it was necessary should be taught, with divine authority, to all nations for all time.

The capacities of the human mind had become so abased, that it could not recover the truths it had lost at the original disobedience; and when the tremendous mysteries we have enumerated were taught by the Church to the world, it surely was not a legitimate argument, lying in the mouths of a race so sunken and debauched, against her authority to allege that the revelations of her divine Master and Founder were contradictory to reason. I wish, I reverentially entreat, every Christian who condemns the teaching of the infallible Church, to note the proposition, and I repeat

it: "And when the tremendous mysteries we have enumerated were taught by the Church to the world, it surely was not a legitimate argument against her authority to allege, that the revelations of her divine Master and Founder were contradictory to reason." No Christian can admit any such principle. This, I trust, will be seen much more fully, and as clearly as demonstration, in the following sections. Human reason, or natural reason, in its ruins and debasement, in the presence of these revealed truths and mysteries, as taught by the Church, had to stand abashed in profoundest humility and conscious degradation, and then, as ever, to confess its utter unfitness to sit in judgment upon a *supernatural* or divine revelation—that system of faith taught by Christ to his Church. The fallibility of human reason, when brought into the *supernatural* presence of divine faith, or a divinely revealed fact, at once shows that reason has no jurisdiction over the revealed truth. Their necessary relations are the *obedience*, by reason, to the teachings of *faith*. And if human reason could not contradict revealed truth, as taught by the Church (with its original authority and composition), how did reason acquire this right, when the same faith was taught by the immediate, or any consecrated,

successors of the Apostles? It is with no ordinary respect for the mind and heart of those who differ from the Church, that this question is put and pressed upon their earnest and profound attention and investigation; for reason itself teaches, that to the divine system of faith, "once delivered to the saints," and for which St. Jude exhorted the Church to contend earnestly, the Church must always hold the same relation which she did at the first. To this system of divinely revealed truths the Church has held—always must hold—the same relation that she did at her institution. I put it to the candor of every investigating mind, if this be not a self-evident teaching of reason in its purity, refinement, and strength? Human reason, in the strictly natural order, was doubtless indirectly invigorated and enlightened by the death of Christ. But it is, doubtless, alike true that the great purpose of his mission and passion was to enlighten faith, the foundation of human reason and action, and in obedience to which reason exerts its solid, graceful, acute, and most excellent powers. He died to reveal to us, through his Church, *supernatural* truths; that is, truths which no natural reason, however strong, disciplined, and subtle, could ever discover. The majority of mankind, from the creation, had so far

failed from approximating to the discovery of these revealed mysteries, by the use of their reason, that they had actually retrograded, until they had become filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, deceit, debate, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, *without understanding*, covenant breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful. These and other disgusting crimes, as recorded in the first chapter of Romans (I quote throughout this essay from the Protestant version), they not only did, but took pleasure in doing. It is thus seen that the majority of mankind had corrupted nearly the whole of the revelation committed to Adam and his posterity. The only portion of this revelation which had been almost universally retained, was that which taught that there was another state of existence beyond the present. This, with more or less dimness and confusion, is, we believe, retained to this day by all pagan tribes; none, at least, have been discovered who do not hold to this tradition. From these considerations it follows that the system of faith, the doctrines revealed by Christ, were not discoverable by human reason; and

if her invention was inadequate to their discovery, it is not perceived why she should assume to judge of their nature by her powers of comprehension, and discredit them if her capacities failed to fathom their philosophy in relation to her puny self. A *fact* surely may be revealed to reason which she cannot comprehend; and her want of comprehension cannot annihilate a fact which exists. Reason teaches this, with all the inexorableness that the infallible Church herself teaches it, when she enforces the truths of divine revelation, without peculiar regard to the behests of any portion of the human mind, save its faith. The utmost pride of human reason must be humbled and confounded in the presence of any supernatural revelation; and faith must come to her relief in her confusion, and attest it true, simply because God has revealed the facts, under circumstances which no incredulity can deny—unless it be atheistic incredulity. Hence, it is a necessary conclusion that the faith, or the truth, revealed, is infallible truth: it must be infallibly true—a necessary fact.

And if this revealed faith was committed to the Church to teach, it is certainly true that she, in teaching it, must teach infallibly; for she is an authority in which Christ abides,

according to his promise, and which cannot err. If man is taught any thing concerning his relations and duties to the *supernatural world*, more than his *natural reason* can discover by observing the facts of nature in the material universe, it is obvious he must be so taught by a divine revelation. And it is equally manifest, that when such divine revelation was made, natural reason was bound to obey its commands, when made in the form of a command. She could not get clear of the *fact* and obligations of the revelation, by a plea of her own incapacity to comprehend their philosophy. Natural reason instructs us that all the institutions which the revelation established, and all the social and religious observances it enjoined, must be observed and fulfilled. The authority of the *supernatural* revelation would certainly be an infallible guide to fallible reason, and she would have no need of her own philosophy and comprehension in her obedience; otherwise such a revelation would be valueless and nugatory. I beseech the kind reader, who does me the honor to read this humble production, to stop and ponder upon this—shall I say truth?—yes! this *truth*.

Such a revelation, in its nature, excludes the idea of its facts and obligations being

contradicted by natural reason. The necessity of a revelation includes the necessity of strict, perfect obedience to the duties and obligations revealed. If natural reason were legitimately to contradict a supernatural revelation, then the same reason would determine the necessity of the revelation. And we must admit such a revelation from a divine being to be of infallible authority, or we are driven to deny the existence of any divine revelation at all. There is no escape from the dilemma. The mightiest intellect, inspired by the acutest genius, cannot be released from it. All the *facts* in the existence of our Saviour, from the conception of the blessed virgin Mary to his ascension into heaven, in the presence of his Church, after his resurrection, are not untrue because of reason's incomprehension of their *natural philosophy*. If natural philosophy be the standard of supernatural facts, the criterion of their existence and truth, it is demanded of the greatest natural philosopher the world has produced, *upon what principles of natural reason it is so?* The proposition is absurd—the terms are logical contradictions. Natural philosophers can disprove all natural facts if such a principle be a criterion of faith, for there is no fact, but some unintelligent natural or human philosopher is ignorant of

its rationale. Indeed, to come to strict truth, in its ultimate, there is no natural fact or phenomenon which natural philosophers do comprehend. Let one of them explain the nature of human and all animal life—the existence and nature of vegetable life, from the germ to the decay of all vegetation—the cohesiveness of the universe—the sources of gravitation. Human philosophers are extremely tenacious—remarkably jealous of their canon of faith, which is, that they will believe no fact that their reason cannot comprehend. But will they tell us what is the *substance of light*—of what material it is composed? How do its component portions of material substances originate and propel from their womb that phenomenon we call light? Who is its father? If our philosophers cannot, with their boasted canon of reason, resolve these questions of the *natural order*, we are certainly not discourteous when we affirm their impudence or supreme ignorance in the application of their canon of faith to a divine and *supernatural* revelation. It can be no discourtesy to any natural man, however exalted his intellectual capacities in their native endowments, however purified and disciplined into vigor and strength by cultivation, however refined and acute by intense devotion

to scientific pursuits in the natural order, to believe his reason wholly, utterly incapable to measure the power, will, and reason of Almighty God in a divine revelation. In other words, it is no discourtesy, but a solemn duty, to deny to him an equality, in endowments, with our common Creator. And, in obedience to duty, we do deny his right and capacity to sit in judgment upon the divine revelations of Jesus Christ and to annul their nature, necessity, and goodness, by an act of his natural reason. The conception of the blessed virgin Mary by the power of the Holy Ghost—the birth of our blessed Saviour from a virgin, immaculately conceived—God cradled in a manger, his sacred humanity, his crucifixion, his death and resurrection, his commission to his Church, and the gift of the Holy Ghost to that Church—are supernatural facts, known to us by divine revelation; and they are mysteries higher and more hidden from natural reason, than are the womb and birth-place and *substance* of light; but neither system of mysteries destroys human reason. It remains erect and supreme in its own dominion after, as before, it consented to believe the facts it does not comprehend.

At the institution of the Church she taught

the *supernatural* facts of divine revelation, and denounced judgment upon those who refused to believe, without regard to the plea that reason gave them no evidence of the faith propounded for their acceptance and practice. What the Church did at her institution, she does yet. She makes no war upon reason, but she sternly rebukes reason when it invades the province of faith. The holy Catholic Church knows, and so instructs the world, that natural reason cannot weigh and measure the facts of divine revelation by her feeble, limited, and ruined capacity. The mysteries of divine revelation are not to be annulled because puny reason cannot unravel them and weave them into harmony with her philosophy. These mysteries are the foundation of the Church which was to "teach all nations" whatsoever Christ *had* commanded her, *before* his ascension; and the Church received the Holy Ghost to bring to her remembrance all the things which *had* been commanded, and to guide her into all truth, and this spirit was promised to abide with her forever. It is obvious that none of these things are on a level with natural reason. It is equally obvious that reason could not perpetuate them any more than she could invent or originate them, nor could any other power of the human soul.

If any could, the Holy Ghost would not have been given as a perpetual remembrancer and guide into all truth. If reason could have perpetuated the infallible truth revealed to the Church, the supernatural power of the Holy Ghost to be her remembrancer and guide, in addition to reason, would not have been required or given. Reason may safely affirm that God would do neither a vain nor an unnecessary thing to perpetuate the divine truth committed to his apostolic Church, to teach to all nations to the end of the world. So that we conclude, upon the most certain principle of reason herself, that she was not only inadequate to originate or invent the divine truths of revelation, but, also, that she had no capacity to perpetuate them in their original purity and integrity, or else the Holy Ghost had not been given for this special purpose. Let reason now be put to the rack and interrogated under torture, and she will tell you that she is not equal to all or any of this scheme of divine faith and mystery. What then did our Saviour command his Apostolic Church to teach? Those who protest against the teaching of the Church, and who make their canon of reason supreme and contradictory to divine faith, must believe that this Church was restricted to teaching a system

strictly in accordance and agreement with, and not of a superior order to, the system of natural and mental philosophy to which they adhere, when they protest against the teaching of the Church, because, as they allege, she teaches for a revelation from God facts which are contrary to their reason.

Is this not the analysis, the fact of their creed? We appeal to them, with all the fraternity of our nature, to examine the fact, and the principle of their position in relation to the divine faith the Church has always, and now teaches. Approach with us the examination of the principle, with the utmost candor and most perfect good-will. The truth of God is not a matter for hot blood and disingenuous prevarication. Its investigation demands the sincerest honesty, the utmost simplicity, and the purest regard for those with whom we investigate its teachings. Then let us repeat the substance of the statement, and let it be examined in the spirit we invoke for its investigation. We say, then, that those who protest against the teaching by the Church of the faith revealed to her, *because* it is contrary to their reason, must maintain the principle (however covertly it has insinuated itself among, and however secretly it has concealed itself with the foundations of their doctrines)

that the Apostolic Church was restricted to teaching a revelation from God, so as to make the revealed truth accord, agree with, and not go above, or out of, the rationale of the systems of natural or mental philosophy to which they adhere, as being the principles of right reason, and to which, in their judgment, human faith must conform, in the *divine order* as well as in the *natural order*. This is a statement not to be questioned without a thought. It demands to be pondered; its idea, and the elemental thought it evolves, both require a sincere consideration. Pride of opinion has nothing to do with it. A sincere reverence for truth and the eternal welfare of all men, should be the handmaidens of its analysis. We take it as granted that it is true. We know that large and numerous classes will not call it in question, as the foundation of their protest against the revealed faith which the Church teaches by the command of her divine Head. Now this decree of reason, this protest that all faith not levelled down to the analyzation of human endowments is therefore *necessarily* false, reduces the supernatural to the natural—it humanizes divine revelation, and denies its superiority to man's endowments. It makes the divinest things merely human; or, rather, in all things equal,

and in nothing superior, to humanity. Are not these just conceptions of the nature and influence of the canon of human reason and the understanding, when they are erected into supreme pontiffs, to decide upon revealed faith? Be it always remembered, that the blessed Jesus did not come to reveal systems of either natural or mental philosophy to his Church.

The world had no need of a divine revelation to teach either, for neither concerned the relations which subsist between every soul of man and the supernatural world. And these relations are all it concerned man to know, and to give a just knowledge of which constituted the whole necessity for a divine revelation, so far as human reason is informed; and, so far, she teaches with all the fearlessness of perfect assurance. Hence, the Church teaches a divine revelation, and not a system of "humanities." She was constituted, organized, to teach the divine faith as revealed to her by her divine Founder, and not to teach natural or mental philosophy. In teaching the faith revealed to her, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, which always abides with her, she cannot err—she teaches infallibly the truth of God, in spirituals and the supernatural order. She teaches truth infallibly,

because it is the very truth revealed to her concerning man's relations to the spiritual and supernatural world, and the Supreme Ruler of that world. God, hence, is always, unto the consummation of the world, teaching through his Church; and the Church, which is kept in perpetual remembrance of these very truths by the Holy Ghost abiding in her, to guide her into all truth which her divine Founder taught to her when she was organized, is necessarily—beyond human contradiction—the keeper of his faith and the treasury of his mercies. He that denies this, denies that Christ is true to his promises: "I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever." "The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name: he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." (John, xiv., 16, 26.) "Therefore, brethren, stand fast and hold the *tradition* ye have been taught, whether by word or our epistle." (2 Thess., v., 13.) Again, we say, we must admit, such a revelation, from a divine being, is of infallible authority, or we are driven to deny the existence of any divine revelation whatever.

We repeat, there is no escape from the dilemma; the mightiest intellect, inspired by the acutest genius, cannot be released from the alternative. We are thus distinct and pointed here in stating this principle and its irrefragable strength, because upon it hinges, in our judgment, *as a principle of human reason, and the sphere of its operations*, the whole question of an infallible teaching authority in the Church of Jesus Christ.

If this position be true, human reason must submit to a supernatural revelation, or else dispute the fact of this revelation. There is no middle ground for question or dispute. It is a divine revelation, and unconditional obedience to its facts and obligations a duty; or it is not such a revelation, and, by consequence, its claims and behests may be disregarded with impunity. If the revelation be divine, it never interferes with the province of natural reason, because the revelation is in another sphere, teaching us concerning other relations and orders than those within the empire and dominion of reason, and hence it cannot conflict with reason's teachings and judgment in its own (*natural*) order. The sphere of reason is the *natural order*, revelation's empire is in the spiritual and *supernatural order*. It is impossible for a conflict

to arise between them, unless reason arrogate to herself authority in an empire where she has no present existence, and to which she has no capacity to extend her being and government.

SECTION II.

THE EXAMPLE OF THE BEREANS, OR THE DUTY OF REASON TO INQUIRE INTO THE GROUNDS OF THE FAITH OF THE INFALLIBLE CHURCH.

IT is the universal law of the world that no man, or set of men, can be condemned unheard. It is a sentiment of justice, without exception, that before any one is censured for his opinions, these opinions be examined and understood. But this justice, somehow, is not meted out to the Catholic Church. Her claims upon reason are never even so much as inquired into; she is condemned without trial, without inquiry; condemned, as we shall more fully see, for faith and practices she does not hold. Let us appeal to reason, if this be just. It is a sure dictate of reason that when Christ commanded his Church to teach all things whatsoever he had commanded them, they were sent to teach infallible truth; that the teaching of error, under the circumstances,

necessities, and promises connected with the commission, was simply an impossibility. It is equally a dictate of reason that, if the Catholic Church be not the identical Church commissioned by Christ, teaching the identical faith the Apostles taught, that then the Church Christ established has been destroyed; the gates of hell have prevailed against it, notwithstanding his infallible promise. We say this is a sure dictate of reason, because there is no other Church which pretends to date its origin back to the Apostles. All others, on the contrary, give it as a clear evidence of the usurpation and *unreasonableness* of the Church that she constantly affirms her unity with the Apostles, and always affirms her infallibility in matters of divine faith. Protestantism this very year (A. D. 1859) has celebrated the anniversary of the three hundredth year of her foundation: of course, she dates her origin 1500 years this side of the Apostles, and cannot claim unity with them; and she does not. As it is then a *fact* that there is but one Church which can claim unity with the Apostles, and does claim it, and which does also claim infallibility, it behooves every man to investigate the foundation on which she is built. For if she do rest on no other foundation than the Apostles,

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

if she be the pillar and ground of truth, and holds and dispenses the faith committed unto the saints, then she has the keys of everlasting life. I trust no one will fail to know, and never forget, that there was a faith delivered unto the saints, and that that faith was to be forever kept pure, and taught to the world. You will see in St. Jude, that he exhorted the Church to contend earnestly for this faith. St. Paul denounced as accursed whoever should teach any other. The commission to the Apostles is conclusive of this "deposit of faith" with the Church, and of her right and obligation to teach it, purely, without any admixture of error, to all nations and generations of men. The Church which presents claims so founded, claims undoubtedly as old as the Apostles, surely demands of reason an investigation of her claims and authority. Reason at this day can claim no exemptions that she was not justified in claiming in the face of the Apostles. Now the Church, in the days of the Apostles, challenged reason to investigate the faith they taught, and the grounds of it. In the seventeenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles we have some remarkable facts upon this subject. Paul "reasoned" with the Jews, at Thessalonica, "out of the Scriptures." And

"lewd fellows of the baser sort," without any investigation, without any inquiry, set the city in an uproar, gathered a mob even, and assaulted the house of Jason, so that the Apostles fled by night to Berea. And it is said of the Bereans: "These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the *word* with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so." Therefore (mark the reason)—"therefore many of them believed; also of honorable women which were Greeks, and of men not a few." Prejudice against the Church, without any investigation of the faith she teaches, and without any examination of her life and doctrines, has always been characterized by the very same moral, mental, and physical phenomena which marked this unreasonable prejudice at Thessalonica. Precisely the same. I appeal to any general persecution, to any local persecution, to the prejudice existing, without violence against the Church, in any city or town. All, all exist *because* the life and faith of the Church has not been investigated and understood. The Bereans are thought more noble than the Thessalonians, simply because they *examined* if those things were so which the Apostles taught. Let it be borne in mind,

too, and pondered on, that these transactions took place A. D. 34, so that the faith and sacraments and observances of the Church were already preached, administered, and established. Now, what Scriptures did the Bereans examine daily, if the faith St. Paul taught, the sacraments he administered, and the observances he commanded, were so? Manifestly not this portion of the Acts of the Apostles, for it is self-evident it was not written, nor did they examine any portion of the New Testament, for all of its epistles were unwritten; nor had the Bereans a copy of any gospel or epistle. It was the Scriptures of the Old Testament they examined; the very same which St. Paul had expounded to them a few days before. For what purpose do I refer to these transactions at Thessalonica and Berea? As an example and monitor and teacher to all who deny the faith of the Church. No Christian historian can come into the presence of the monuments of Christian antiquity and then question that the Catholic Church is an institution which dates its origin and foundation with the Apostles. Its antiquity, *as an institution*, is undisputed. Its right to teach was not questioned by the Reformers, and it is not denied now because of any pretence or al-

legation that she is an institution whose organization, as claimed by herself, is spurious. It has never been pretended that her organization took place in some century subsequent to the Apostles. But her authority to teach was and is denied by Protestants, because, as they allege, after some fifteen centuries had elapsed, through which she had kept the faith once delivered to the saints, in spite of the malign assaults of a hundred heresies, she then either corrupted the faith or parted with its sacred deposit. Now this is obviously a question of simple *fact*. It is not a matter for prejudice, for declamation, but for investigation. It is not a matter to be settled by assertion or denunciation, but by an honest scrutiny of the life of the Church for fifteen hundred years. It is not a question which mere education, preconception, or prejudice can rationally and honestly decide. History for fifteen centuries, beginning at the Apostles, the life of the Church for fifteen hundred years, beginning at the martyrdom of St. Peter, must be read and scrutinized to ascertain the truth. This history and this life must be interrogated as to the faith and practice of the Church during this long and eventful period. And when we ascertain what her faith and practice were—what her

doctrines and institutions were during this time, we will have performed our duty, as the Bereans did, and not before. This task will be easy, upon one condition: if the Church has been one and universal (Catholic) in her faith and institutions, her history will be easily traced; but if she have *changed* and varied, the task may be more or less difficult. And if the changes have been frequent, intricate, and subtle, it may be a work of vast labor to track her steps and variations through the lapse of so many years. But still, the *first change* which may be discovered in faith and sacramental institutions, will effectually defeat her claim to infallibility and catholicity at once. So there will be no need of tracing her through different ages and countries, if indeed she have thus ever changed. For one change of a dogma of faith, or one change in her sacramental institutions, will be her complete condemnation. So that the Church puts those who accuse her upon an easy trial for her conviction. Almost anybody is equal to her successful prosecution, if indeed she be guilty. But it is objected to her, on all hands, that in faith and institutions she never changes. The charge of anti-progressiveness is a complete refutation of the other charge. Each convicts the other

of error. Her corruption of the faith, and her intolerance to change, are contradictory charges, and the one annuls the truth and force of the other. The Church boasts that she never changes. Her opposers denounce her as inimical to human progress, *because* she never has, and proclaims she never will, change; and yet she is accused of parting with or corrupting the faith committed originally to her keeping. Now we appeal to the candor, logical power, and reason of fair-minded men, who have been misled by education, without any investigation of their own, to adopt both of these accusations, if it be not their duty, in honor and religion, to go to the standards of faith which the Church recognizes and teaches to her children, and, with the noble Bereans, see whether these things be so. For if the objection of the Church's enemies, and her boast that she never changes, be true, then the task of tracing her history, her life, through successive ages, is as easy as a steady historical gaze upon any great, prominent, universal, unwavering historical fact can be. As she claims she has never changed, and as her accusers denounce her intolerance of change, her obliviousness to the world's progressions, it may be assumed as a fact that she has never changed. If

such change has taken place, it is a simple duty which those who assert it owe to the world and their own intelligence and candor, to state the place *where*, and the time when it occurred or was introduced. It is plainly more than absurd, it is at least thoughtless, for any moral being to assert that a change has taken place in any institution, unless he can specify its original constitution, and then specify the alteration of its original condition, as a matter of fact. Hence it is the obvious duty of all those who, either thinkingly or thoughtlessly, assert a change in the faith of the Church, to state exactly its original constitution, in faith and sacraments, as established by the Apostles, and then to state, with like exactness, the alteration which the Church has made in the apostolic constitutions. Before they can assert the change with justice to themselves and the Church, they must master her life, her history, so far as clearly to show the original constitutions, and the extent and the nature of their perversion. Such a mastery of her life will necessarily elicit the time when, the place where, and the person or persons by whom the changes, perversions, and corruptions were initiated. The faithful Bereans would have done so. Thus we are brought to the simple *fact* which

is to be decided by investigation: did the Church either corrupt the deposit of faith originally committed to her keeping, or part from it about the commencement of the sixteenth century? We are now in a position to solve this question of *simple fact*, by a simple comparison. We can compare her dogmas of faith and sacramental institutions, then and now held, with the dogmas of faith and institutions which she for a century before, or for five centuries before, or for fifteen centuries before, had held and observed. And if those then and now held agree with those before held, then the accusation against the Church is manifestly, self-evidently untrue. Nothing can be more simple than this investigation. No man can solve any historical question, to his entire satisfaction, so readily as he can this. He may arrive at it with infallible certainty, with the utmost ease and precision. All he has to do, is to examine what any one bishop, in communion with the Catholic Church, in all these fifteen centuries, has taught to his flock. If he choose he may examine them all. But, as it is universally conceded that the Church tolerates no disagreement in matters of faith, among her bishops in communion with her head, it is only necessary to examine the teaching

of any one bishop, not under censures or excommunicated, to ascertain the faith of all. Thus the examination of one bishop's teaching will establish the faith of the entire Church in any one age. And then compare the teachings of this one bishop in this (any one) age with the teaching of any other bishop, in any other age, and so on through fifteen centuries; and if any disagreement be found in dogmas of faith or canonical institutions, then the case is made out against the Church; she is neither infallible, nor catholic, nor in unity with the Apostles. But mark! the test, in all instances, must be made upon the teaching of a bishop in union with the supreme head of the Church, and not upon one either under censures or excommunicated for errors. Neither must it be made upon the teaching of an excommunicated priest, nor upon any declaration of his; still less must it be made upon the statements of soured, disaffected, corrupt, or ambitious politicians; but, chiefest of all, we must not take the accusations of the historians of Henry VIII. and his daughter, Queen Elizabeth, and those successive writers who have propagated the traditions of their historians, and to these have, sometimes, added most unjust charges of their own. The Church should be judged by her

own standards of faith. It is a simple justice which our common humanity, the ordinary courtesies of social life, and the charities of religion, all require that she should be thus judged. If those generous and high-toned men, who dissent from the Church, knew how provokingly insulting, how unamiably untrue, how violative of all the courtesies and amenities of life, their objections to the divine teaching of the Church are, *because* they continue to reaffirm the interested and malicious charges of Henry's and Elizabeth's historians, and those who follow their traditions,—we know that ordinary self-respect, which dwells in the bosom of all candid and enlightened men, would coerce them to become acquainted with what the Church does believe and does teach her children. Young gentlemen, well read in these objectionable histories, would not violate the sacredness of hospitality, in the household of Catholics, by asking questions insinuating grievous untruths, if they would learn from our standards of faith what we do believe, because the Church teaches us to believe. Respectable and even learned clergymen would not declaim from their pulpits against imaginary dogmas, and denounce the holy Church and her children, upon the faith they repose in these so-called histories, if they

had read and studied the canons of faith, which is the life of the Church and the consolation of her children. They would, as honorable men, without regard to the duties of religion, crave pardon of every child of the Church they meet, if, after one of their fiery denunciations against "the man of sin" and "the mysteries of popery," they could immediately receive into their minds a knowledge of the teachings of the faith which the Church dispenses to the faithful.

Even when their admiration of some champion of the faith is excited by his extraordinary virtues, and they desire to do such a character justice, in a moral point of view, they do themselves and the faith gross injustice in their eulogiums, because of their want of acquaintance with the faith we believe. Take a sentence or two of Sir James Mackintosh, a man in natural and moral accomplishments with but few peers, as an instance. Speaking of the trial of Sir Thomas More, who was put to death by Henry VIII., because he would not adjudge his divorce from his wife, and sanction Henry's illicit connection with Anne Boleyn, to be in accordance with the law of God, Sir James says: "On the sixth of the same month, almost immediately after the defeat of every attempt to practise on

his firmness, More was brought to trial at Westminster; and it will scarcely be doubted that no such culprit stood at any European bar for a thousand years. It is rather from caution than necessity that the ages of Roman domination are excluded from the compari son. It does not seem that in any moral respect Socrates himself could claim a su periority." (British Essayists. Mackintosh's Life of Sir Thomas More.)

Now the humblest child of the Church, acquainted with the character of Sir Thomas —who ever entered the sacred and merciful tribunal of penance with a contrite heart— if he did not know how well meant this compliment was, would resent Sir James' ignorance of the real splendors of the "culprit's" character as insulting in the extreme. Sir Thomas' "moral character" was not *the* character the accomplished gentleman and scholar admires. Far from it. It was the splendor of his faith, the spiritual man and character, which, without his knowledge, excited his admiration and produced his eulogium. It was the faith which sustained St. Stephen that sustained Sir Thomas. And any comparison between him and any Grecian or Roman, however illustrious in mere moral attributes, is a robbery alike of the Church

and a desecration of the fame and faith of Sir Thomas, who was manifestly a martyr to his faith, and not to his mere moral accomplishments. If Sir James Mackintosh had had a smattering knowledge even of Catholic faith, derived from the recognized standards of the Church, he would have felt most keenly that his fame as a thinker, scholar, and gentleman, was badly damaged by the compliment, at least in the eyes of every intelligent Catholic. But he meant well, and he has our heart's warmest gratitude for the intention and for his honesty of purpose. But while we yield him our esteem because of his intention, we must assure him that he has done Sir Thomas a remarkable injustice—remarkable in its source, and nature, and object. More laid down his life in obedience to the faith the Church had taught him, that neither king nor man can annul the sacred tie of matrimony, lawfully made, without incurring the judgment of God against the crime and all who participate in its commission. It was the spiritual man, the man enlightened by divine faith, who was murdered on account of his faith, and not the moral man, on account of the sublimity of the morals which he had in common with Socrates. Doubtless a grand moral character will abandon life for the sake of duty;

but between the motives of Socrates and Sir Thomas there is a spiritual gulf which forbids all comparison and analogy. Sir James has not even the conception, still less the appreciation, of a spiritual man, and the holy faith which makes him what he is. That spiritual life, derived from the teachings of the Church, which has been the consolation and support of her millions of martyrs and saints, and which, more or less, is characteristic of the life of all her obedient children, Sir James failed to conceive and interpret, because he was ignorant of the faith which gives it birth and being. In this he, unintentionally, did himself, the Church, and Sir Thomas More a great injustice. To return, then, to the point directly in hand: in one word, then, the Church must be judged by her own standards of faith, which she does teach and always has taught to her children, and by her own institutions which she maintains, in obedience to the original command, for their consolation, and not by the unjust declamations or well-meant eulogies of those who are utterly ignorant of her life and character and teaching. This is the naked justice which is measured out to the meanest culprit in all systems of jurisprudence, and which ought not to be denied to the Church by any man of sense

and equity of character. And I do not doubt, when the case is thus presented, that any just man, no matter what prejudice he entertains against her, will agree at once that this is the mode in which the Church should be tried; and he will procure some recognized standard of her doctrines and study it, before he again (if he ever has) denounces her teaching. Let such a man institute, in a very slight manner, with us, the comparison to which we have before referred, as testing the unity of the Church with the Apostles, and as testing the fact whether she teaches now the very faith they taught to the world. Well, then, St. Ignatius was martyred, cast to lions in the amphitheatre at Rome, A. D. 107. He was ordained bishop of Antioch by St. Peter, and was intimately acquainted with SS. Peter and Paul; he was also intimate with the Apostle St. John. St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp (martyred A. D. 166) were devoted companions and bishops, the first at Antioch, the other at Smyrna. St. Polycarp, the angel of the Church at Smyrna—so called in the Apocalypse—was personally acquainted with the Apostle St. John, who wrote the Apocalypse. Again, St. Irenæus, who was martyred, with nineteen thousand children of the Church, in the vicinity of Lyons, A. D. 202, was an intimate

friend of St. Polycarp; Polycarp educated him. These will, therefore, undoubtedly, bring the faith of the Apostles, pure and direct, to the year A. D. 202. Now what did the bishops of Antioch, Smyrna, and Lyons teach? And what did all the fathers and saints in communion with them, up to A. D. 202, teach? and what did the fathers and saints, in union with the Church through its supreme head, teach from A. D. 202 up to the sixteenth century? We first respond, that not one of them taught the faith of any protesting sect. It is presumed that this fact will not be questioned by any candid man well read in the life of the Church prior to the year 1500; and if not, may we not beseech all to consider the import of so plain but so startling a fact? Let us repeat the statement: Not one of them, the saints and fathers, taught the faith of any one sect now protesting against the right of the Church to teach. And upon an examination of their acts, it will be found that they universally (catholically) taught the faith and observed the institutions the Church now teaches and observes. Let us repeat the commendation of the Bereans in the 17th chapter of Acts: "These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the Word with

all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether these things were so. *Therefore many of them believed;* also of honorable women, which were Greeks, and of men not a few." Their belief was the result of examination, not of prejudice and declamation. Is the word of faith which Paul and Silas taught and the sacraments which they then administered, and which had then been taught and ministered twenty-one years, from the death of Christ, less worthy of the respectful and candid examination of men now than they were then? If this question be answered in a manly spirit of candor, which is the response we earnestly entreat for it, it must be answered in the negative. What then? Simply that it is the highest duty of every man to examine daily the standards of faith recognized by the Church, with "willing minds," and to judge from the evidence these standards will afford, whether the things she teaches and has ever taught, since the Bereans were converted, be so. It is the very faith, the *system of faith*, taught to the Bereans, which challenges our scrutiny. And this scrutiny, when made under their commendable example, will coerce our faith. The investigation is easy, and, at every step, is made *in the light of the*

purest reason. No act of aggression is made upon any province of hers, in any part of the inquiry. No abasement of this noble faculty is demanded in all the range of the investigation; but, by a scrutiny of the facts, in the full dominion of reason, we arrive at the feet of the Apostles, and receive from them the exact revelation which Christ commanded them to teach to all nations to the end of the world; yet, arrived there, reason must stand mute and accept the faith they teach. Reason there must not question with the Apostles, and demand that her rationality shall not accept their revelation, because she cannot account, on philosophical principles, for the nature of the facts revealed. She must not say to the Apostles that their revelation is not consonant to her powers. Her powers are inadequate to scrutinize the reasons of God, connected with a divine revelation. She must inquire, it is true, whether *the facts* ("these things") be so; but there she must stop, and not inquire into the *reasons* existing in the divine mind, for revealing *the facts*, and for revealing them in the form, substance, and under the circumstances which they are revealed. This is madness, not reason. Her highest duty to herself, the most reasonable duty she can perform, is to obey God, *because*

it is a fact he commands her to obey. The fact, and not the reason for it, is the rule of obedience. If reason's capacities were to measure the philosophy of God's mercies, in revelation, then, indeed, is human reason superior to the mercy of God. There is one philosophy in all divine revelation to human reason which it may fathom, and only one; and that is, that all revelation from God is in mercy to man. Any further than this, reason has no jurisdiction in a matter of divine revelation. Her most potential teaching, however, is, that it is folly to reject the mercy on the conditions revealed, *because* she cannot fathom the mysteries of the revelation. She must accept the revelation and obey its commands, or she must dethrone the Revealer, as having no power to make a revelation which exceeds her comprehension.

This is undoubtedly the natural, rightful, and inevitable position of reason, at the feet of the Apostles. And when we trace the teaching of the Church, from their altars and feet, up through passing ages to the 16th century, and then find her bishops in communion with her head teaching the same revealed faith committed to the Apostles, the position of reason will be the same at the feet of the bishops and the altars of the

Church in the 16th century, that it was before the same altars when the Apostles taught the same revelation at the institution of Christianity. Reason teaches this with absolute authority. She demands for the bishops of the Church, when teaching divine revelation in the 16th century, the same implicit faith that she demanded for the Apostles when teaching the same faith in the first century. The bishops of the 16th century, teaching the same faith (revelation) which the Apostles taught in the beginning, are entitled to the same respect, from reason, to which the Apostles were entitled. And reason imperatively demands the same credence and the same obedience for the one as the other. The position of reason, in relation to infallible authority, is the same in all ages of the Church. And she can no more divest herself of these relations to the infallible teaching power in the 19th century, than she could in the first. Her rights are exactly the same in both ages. If reason can teach any thing infallibly, it is the truth that her rights are exactly the same in both ages; and that her authority is no more potent in the last age than in the first.

SECTION III.

THOSE WHO REJECT THE TEACHING OF THE INFALLIBLE CHURCH, WITHOUT CAREFULLY EXAMINING ITS STANDARDS OF FAITH, AS THE BEREANS DID THE TEACHING OF ST. PAUL, DO NOT USE REASON, BUT SUBMIT TO THE TEMPER OF THE THESSALONIANS. CLAMOR AND PERSECUTION THE SURE INDICIA OF PREJUDICE AND NON-INVESTIGATION, BUT NEVER THE CRITERION OF REASON.

IN the seventeenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles there are three prominent transactions in the life of the Church, occurring twenty-one years after the ascension of our Saviour, and three times seven years after she had established the faith her divine Master had commanded her to teach, and had administered the sacraments he taught her to administer to her children. I say *after* the faith was established, because we are so told in the 4th and 5th verses of the 16th chapter of these Acts, and in these words: "And as they went through the cities they delivered them the *decrees* for to keep, that were ordained of the Apostles and elders which were at Jerusalem *And so* were the Churches *established in the faith*, and increased in num-

ber daily." Now these three prominent transactions, so related in the 17th chapter, we desire to group before the reader as matters of pointed significance in the matter in hand. And first, when St. Paul at Thessalonica for "three Sabbath-days reasoned with the Thessalonians out of the Scriptures, opening and alleging that Christ must needs have suffered and risen again from the dead" (a miraculous statement); "and this Jesus, whom I preach unto you, is Christ" (the *man* crucified at Jerusalem twenty-one years before), "some believed. But the Jews which believed not, moved with envy, took unto them certain lewd fellows of the baser sort, and gathered a company, and set all the city in an *uproar*, and assaulted the house of Jason," and they dragged him out of his house because he had entertained Paul and Silas. And to infuriate the rulers and mob, they alleged that the Church designed to overthrow the civil government of Cæsar. The Apostles were thus compelled to flee away in the night, and went to Berea. Here the second transaction occurred which we desire to be noted. And it is said that "these were more noble than those at Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily whether

these things were so." But when the Jews at Thessalonica heard of it, they came to Berea and here "stirred up the people," and Paul had to fly to Athens. And at this place the third transaction occurred which we wish to be marked. In this city, when Paul saw it was wholly given to idolatry, his spirit was stirred in him, and he disputed in the synagogues and in the market with those that met him; and then he encountered Epicurean and Stoic philosophers. "And some said, what will this babbler say? other some, he seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods; because he preached unto them Jesus and the resurrection." But being desirous to *hear more of this new* doctrine, they took him to the Areopagus. And he stood in the midst of Mars' Hill, and said: "Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things you are too superstitious. For as I passed by and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription, To THE UNKNOWN GOD. Whom, therefore, ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you." These transactions involve matter for a volume of considerations. But I leave them to the contemplation of the reader with but two remarks; and, first, it is clearly seen in them that it is only the candid, sincere inquirer, who honestly investigates truth,

who believes it; and that the bigot who wraps himself within the impenetrable folds of his prejudice, and arrays popular clamor to keep his conscience at peace with his obstinacy, and the frivolous and unthinking caterer to his own idle curiosity and passing amusement, are alike left under the severe condemnation against the unbeliever, contained in the command to the Church to teach all nations, to the end of the world. The second remark that these transactions suggest, is that they verify, in a remarkable manner, the unelaborated propositions at the head of this section. With these remarks we proceed to the direct discussion of these propositions. And, without doubt, there is no inquiry of so much importance to man as the investigation of those divine revelations, made to the Church by its divine Master, through her teaching, of which he is instructed in the relations he holds to the *supernatural* world, its supreme ruler and inhabitants. The faith and institutions of the Catholic Church claim to be the embodiment of the very revelation which Jesus Christ made to his Apostles, and which he commanded it to teach all nations, unto the end of the world. This claim has always been made, and has always been acted upon by her. For whatever other accu-

sation may be brought against her, there is no one who will accuse her of ever, for one moment, intermitting this claim or of ceasing to demand its recognition by the entire race of man. She has from the first been a city set upon a hill. If this claim was originally well founded on the revelation of Christ and the commission to teach all nations, to the end of time, it must be equally well founded now; unless evidence as clear as the original command can be shown, to prove that her foundation on the apostolic commission has been dug up, and the superstructure reared upon it has been overthrown. Where is the evidence? What does an allegation of its existence import? Simply that the word and promise of the blessed God has failed! Blasphemy! But if it were allowable thus to impeach the veracity of the Almighty God, where are any *facts* in the march of the Church through successive ages to show that she has abandoned one article of all *the* faith which the blessed Lord revealed to her and commanded her to teach to the nations? In what period of her history has she ceased to administer any sacrament or offer the sacrifice her divine Founder instituted? When, if ever, did she institute a sacrament or teach a faith not revealed to the Apostles, and

brought to her remembrance by the Holy Ghost, guiding her into all truth? These are questions of vital import, eternally vital, and they cannot be reasonably answered but by a statement of specific facts, attested by credible testimony. Facts, and not declamation, must state the time when, the occasion on which, and the heresiarchs who robbed the Church of her birthright, which is the revelation of Jesus Christ. Reason demands this sort of exposition, and will be satisfied with no other. But no one can be prepared to answer the questions until he have scrutinized the faith and institutions of the Church as she now exists, and then have scrutinized her origin and her progress through centuries. And it is very safe to say that not one in a million of those who reject her claims upon their faith and obedience, has ever done this. And it is equally fair to presume, at least, that no writer whatever, who has assailed the teaching of the Church, has ever honestly and candidly and patiently studied her canons of faith, and the evidence of their veracity, with a sincere desire to arrive at the real truth, as verily taught by her to her children. No writer can be produced who has declaimed against the teaching of the Church, but that any well-instructed son of hers will tell you

at once, often indignantly, that the author has failed, most lamentably, with cruel injustice, to state the truth concerning her dogmas. Is not this a fact as startling as singularly amazing? How is it to be accounted for? Certainly not by any suggestion that Catholics utter falsehoods as to their faith, by denying it to be what it is. The Church, in her life, has seen too many tens of thousands of her children, in all times and nations, martyred, for this uncharitable proposition to gain any credence with men of scrupulous honor or a high sense of justice, accompanied with any creditable degree of cultivation. It is too foul a charge—it is too uncourteous to human character, as developed under all the forms of the Christian religion, at least, to allow it for a moment to account for the fact in question. For it is equivalent to the assertion that no well instructed or devout Catholic is a gentleman; that not one such but will utter a mean and cowardly falsehood as to the real faith which his Church teaches him and which she observes. But few of those who reject the faith will thus outrage at once their own self-respect, the religious character, and individual and personal honor of *all* the instructed and devout Catholics in the world. A solution is, then, still want-

ing, for the amazing and startling fact that no writer can be produced, who has declaimed against the Church and her dogmas of faith, whose work, in numberless, material, and most important statements, will not, without any hesitancy, be said to be wanting in truth by any instructed or devout Catholic. We have just seen we cannot account for it by charging that such Catholics are universally, without any exception, destitute of religious obligations and wanting in individual and personal honor. How are we, then, to explain this mystery? By maintaining, on the other hand, that these opposers of the Church are universally guilty of wilful falsehood? By no means. That is not the key to this remarkable mystery, either. The truth which unlocks it is this: These writers consist of two classes. The first class is made up of those who never in their lives saw any work which is recognized by the Church as a standard of her doctrines, but who have taken for gospel the traditionary statements of her maligners as to what she teaches. These are principally conversant with bad histories and illiterate controvertists. The other class consists of *professional* controvertists, who do not study the standards of the Church to acquire a knowledge of her spirit and intention, and

to know the truth as she teaches it. But they "pick up" a standard work with the preconception of a feed lawyer who unshelves his library to find "a case" to support the side he has been employed to support. They glance at the statements in such a standard with the eager hope that they may catch some phrase which they may, by distortion, at least, wrest from its context, to suit and back the deep prejudice and bitter opposition they entertain against Catholics and Catholic institutions. They see nothing as it is, but every thing through their preconceptions against the Church; which preconception, in their partisan zeal, they as religiously believe is an infallible fact, as the devout Catholic religiously believes the dogmas of faith the Church teaches to him are divine revelation. Our controvertist does not seek for truth: that is not what he is in search of in a catholic standard, for he believes, before he opens it, there is none there. He is hunting for evidence to prove that his antipathies are just; for facts to show his fellows that what they all believe concerning the faith of the Church is exactly what she teaches. (We know the spirit of this class well, for we have been slightly initiated into their confederacy ourselves.) Such men examine in a temper and

for a purpose that forbids knowledge, and incapacitates for the acquisition and statement of truth concerning the faith they seek to ruin, but not to understand. There is one marked vice which universally attaches itself to this class: they state their conclusions for facts. The conclusion in their mind is that the Church is in error. They no more doubt this before they enter on their investigation than the illiterate and badly read class do. Hence their objections to the Church would be good if their previous conclusions were facts instead of inferences from nothing. But, nevertheless, they do not state wilful falsehoods. They mistake prejudice for dispassionateness; conclusion for fact; confound the teachings of the partisan with the investigation of the philosopher; the one-sided view of the feed counsel for the deliberately weighed judgment of the court. This, we think, is an accurate and reliable account of the seemingly inexplicable mystery we have been discussing.

But there is another mystery: Why is it that the "mass" of men rely on the one-sided statements of these very unsafe guides? Why is it that, in an age of universal literary activity, what is, confessedly, the oldest institution on the earth—an institution that has

lived through all the ages of Christendom, has spoken all languages, and has taught and educated men of renown, as well as the commonalty in all ages, in every country under heaven,—why has there not been more inquiry among the "masses" as to what she does teach, and as to the life she has lived? All this is the more astonishing—unutterably astonishing—because the record of the Church's life is more universally accessible than that of any tribe, nation, or institution which now exists or which has ever existed. And if she have surrendered or perverted the faith once delivered to the saints, it is very easy to point to the chapter in her history, and to the country and age in which she ceased to fulfil the commission of her divine Master. No fact in the history of the world can be so universally accessible as this, if it really exist. And hence we, with calm confidence, challenge the learning and genius of the world of her opposers to enter upon the inquiry and prosecute it through all ages, by the standards of the Church's faith in the same ages. When, then, did she cease to fulfil the commission? At what time, in what government, did she begin to be "a setter forth of strange gods" and a new faith? Or to be a setter forth of a *strange* faith con-

cerning The Unknown God? The Church, as an institution, is covered with the glories of more than eighteen centuries. In all the transactions of men who have any history, she has signalized her zeal and spiritual authority and power during all this period of time. Never, for one moment, has she relaxed either. Were there any other institution of her antiquity claiming to have a fixed faith and unvarying standards attested by universal modes of action, unquestionably it would be examined critically by most intelligent persons ignorant of its life and character. Literary men, critics, philosophers, statesmen—everybody would be investigating its constitution and character. Its nature would be scrutinized with the utmost care and devout attention; especially would it be so if this (supposed) other institution claimed to build its organization and faith upon a commission from a divine Founder, commanding a select order of men to teach it to all the world, and who uttered the severest—eternal condemnation upon those who disbelieved their teaching. And if, indeed, in assumed obedience to the command and commission, she had taught the faith in every character of government, and among every description of people, enjoining all, from the prince on

the throne, or from the turbulent chief of his tribe or caste, to the beggar at the gateway of wealth, to submit their hearts and lives to its teachings and the practice of its precepts, demanding of them all to go into a secret tribunal, which she describes as one of love and mercy, and there confess their very thoughts when violative of her standards of purity and holiness, in order to a full communication of her graces,—then its challenge to the attention and scrutiny of the world would be, morally, so decisive as to compel a thorough investigation of its claims. And the fact that the claims of this (supposed) other institution, thus imposing, thus universal in its character, passed unheeded without scrutiny by any one, would be an argument against his reason and his intelligence. And, looking at the Catholic Church as the only institution of an antiquity dating back to the Apostles, universal in her offices, everywhere demanding implicit faith in her teachings, subsisting in all societies, speaking the language now, as at the Day of Pentecost, of all people, it is strange, beyond measure strange, that the world who is not of her children will not examine into the origin and progress of this catholic (universal) institution. The neglect of those who reject her claims to teach

all nations, to search her recognized standards to see whether their protest against her authority "be so"—be well founded on the faith she teaches; this neglect to understand before protesting and opposing and rejecting, operates as a "strong delusion" to overwhelm minds, in other respects clear, enlightened, and candid, in the grossest injustice against the sentiments, life, and faith of all the children of the Catholic Church. The sentiments, principles, and faith which, under this "delusion," are attributed to these children, are frequently gross, indecent, and repulsive in the extreme to them; and, if really entertained by them as articles of faith, as active feelings of their hearts, would surely produce in their lives, conduct and action intolerably revolting. And yet what is the open, patent, observed fact, in every community where the Catholics have a church, an altar, and daily sacrifice upon that altar? Surely no candid man will allege against them the grossness and immorality of life which would necessarily flow from the faith which is imputed to them as the fundamental principle of their moral and religious life. The incongruity between the moral and religious life of the devout Catholic and the faith imputed to him, is itself a miracle if the charges of the enemies of the

Church against her be true. It is a mystery, a profound, philosophical mystery, which challenges the learning and genius of those who live under this "strong delusion" of error, in regard to her, to account for on some rational and approved principle in the science of the human mind and life. If the commission on which the Church is founded, and on the authority of which she teaches, did not specify in itself any articles of faith to be taught, but commanded her to "teach and observe all things whatsoever" her divine Master had *before* commanded her, and if it did not specify the institutions to be organized, nor the sacraments to be administered, any further than the same command to "teach and observe all things whatsoever" he had before revealed unto her, then reason, with all her imperial prerogatives, demands that we should go to the fathers of the Church to know of them what faith the Apostles did teach, and to learn what institutions they did organize. Reason attests the true mode of investigating a simple matter of fact like this, be to the ascertaining what the persons originally commissioned DID in obedience to and in pursuance of their authority. This is of the essence of that reason and common sense so much esteemed by all who reject the teaching of the Church.

Yet who of them all has ever been thus obedient to reason, respectful to himself, and just to the infallible Church? We here again challenge the production of a single doctor or historian, opposed to her, who has thus investigated her claims. There is no author who has written against her, but who has made such absurd statements concerning the faith, as makes it self-evident to the Catholic mind that no such examination has been had. Her standards of doctrine they have wholly misconceived; and the unjust and sometimes even ludicrous representations, founded on the misconception, leaves one in doubt whether to weep or laugh. Instead of an inductive or analytic method of investigation, these philosophers make none at all. They seize upon a dogma of faith, and regarding it as it is commonly spoken of by those who are accustomed to stigmatize it—that is, without any of its concomitants, without any of its conditions and limitations, without any of the elements which, in the mind and pious belief of the Church, enter into its *definition*—they, as it were, "nick-name" it, and then, upon this abstract name, they fasten concrete ideas, as strange to the Church as they are unjust to those ornaments, alike of human nature and grace, which have adorned her

history in all countries, and through all the vicissitudes of time. It is thus they mistake matters simply of practice for articles of faith, and thus often, to the astonishment of the Catholic, confounding one with the other, declaim against both as against human reason and common sense. We have already seen that this mode of thought and criterion of faith is of no more validity now than it was when it was urged (or might have been) at the altar of the Apostles, if the Church teaches the faith revealed to them by Jesus Christ. We will see its utter incompatibility with reason by and by. Those who thus carelessly, for partisan purposes, investigate the claims of the Church, forget that she was established by Christ as an infallible teacher, to instruct all nations, to the end of time. And they forget that the teaching of the Apostles and their immediate successors, at least, could not be set aside or gainsayed *because* those whom they taught did not grasp the force of the *supernatural* communications by the power of their *natural* reason. Reason cannot annihilate a fact nor escape its obligations, by her incompetency to measure its rationality. The apostolic teaching was with infallible authority. Their immediate successors so taught; and, on the

theory of our opponents, it is an interesting inquiry of eternal import to find out at what stage of the succession this infallible authority ceased. There could not be error in any dogma of faith the Apostles taught, nor in any sacrament they administered, nor any ordinance they established, nor in any decree they made for the perpetuation of the faith. The faith they taught was revealed from God; and human reason had no natural right and no acquired authority to impose upon faith a denial of the revealed doctrines, *because* they did not coincide with her pride, her preconceptions, and her strength. The revelation was infallible; reason is always fallible. And the Church always has taught, and she now teaches, the same points of faith which the Apostles taught, and she of course teaches it with the infallibility with which they taught it, and reason has no more power to discredit the faith now than she had to discredit the personal apostolic teaching of its truths. Reason herself proclaims this with her purest authority and highest prerogatives. And hence reason further teaches to all dissenters from the Church, that to investigate her right to teach infallibly is not to measure the nature of her faith and her authority to teach it, by their reason. It is a matter of fact that they

have no standard of reason among themselves by which to measure either reason or faith, but each of the five hundred and odd varieties into which those who protest against her authority are divided, has a different standard of reason by which to measure divine faith. Now reason, again, teaches that the Apostles did not establish five hundred variations of either faith or reason, and as many more as may hereafter protest, on new grounds, against the divine revelation the Church teaches.

Hence it is easy to perceive—reason knows it—that there is some essential vice in the mode by which the antagonists of the Church investigate her claims. Whether it be traceable into a distinct idea or a valid definition or not, it is surely true that there is an essential viciousness in the mode and principle on which they proceed. The reasonable mode and the principle of reason, is to proceed either by induction or by analysis: analysis, by taking the faith now taught by the Church, and, tracing it up step by step, through every age, until we arrive at the teaching instituted by the Apostles, under the divine commission of Jesus Christ; induction, by beginning at the teaching instituted and practised as soon as the commission was given, and then tracing

it down, step by step, through each successive century, until we arrive at Pope Pius IX. And if, in either mode of investigation, we find her teaching, her sacraments and institutions, always the same, we are as fully assured, BY REASON, that the Church is an infallible teacher, as we are that the Apostles were the infallible expounders of the authority contained in the commission. This is a proposition addressed to both reason and common sense. It is as infallibly true as they can pronounce any fact to be. And the highest achievements of human reason, and the sublimest reach of common sense, will approve it in all its extent. The province of reason, therefore, is not invaded while it is required by the Church to stand mute in the presence of a revelation of God, taught to her children by the Church, and while reason is commanded not to interrupt the province of faith in believing alone, because God, through his divinely appointed Church, teaches as she was commanded. Reason admits this, and demands, within her sphere, for faith all the reverence in her credence that the Church does within her sphere of teaching power and authority.

SECTION IV.

THE ANTECEDENT PROBABILITY THAT IF A DIVINE REVELATION WERE MADE TO BE TAUGHT THROUGH ALL TIME, THAT AN ORDER OF TEACHERS WOULD BE CONSECRATED TO TEACH IT WITH INFALLIBLE CERTAINTY, OR THAT A DIVINE REVELATION, COMMANDED TO BE TAUGHT, WOULD BE TAUGHT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE WILL OF THE REVEALER, AND THEREFORE TRULY, AND NOT ERRONEOUSLY.

IT is in the highest degree probable that if God, in his providential dealings with mortal man, found it necessary (humanly speaking) to reveal a religion to him, the observance and practice of which would be necessary to instruct him as to the relations he sustained and the obligations he owed to the supernatural world, and as conditions to his immortal happiness, that he would constitute an order of teachers—a priesthood—to perpetuate the truths revealed. This is a probability which we think reason will fully approve and firmly support. For otherwise the revelation would be lost, and man again become ignorant of his relations and obligations to the supernatural world and its holy Ruler; and successive revelations would be

necessary to restore man to the true position in which it was the will of God to place him by the revelation of himself to his fallen creature. And these successive revelations would have to be made to every successive generation, and to each member of the human family in every generation. This follows from the nature of man and a divine revelation; for if no order of men were constituted to teach it, that is, to perpetuate it, it is manifest it would lose its authority with the death of the original recipients. After the death of him or them to whom it was communicated, no person or order of persons would have authority to teach that such revelation ever was made. Hence the Saviour said, "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth; go ye, therefore: and as the Father hath sent me, even so I send you: He that heareth *you*, heareth me; and he that heareth me, heareth the Father that sent me." The constitution, then, of an order of priesthood to perpetuate the revelation of Jesus Christ, and attest it to all ages, was a divine appointment in exact accordance—so far as reason can perceive—with the natural constitution of the human mind. By what authority is it, then, assumed that the means ordained for the perpetuity of the revelation are contrary to

reason? Reason teaches exactly to the contrary, with her utmost precision and her clearest power. The teaching power originally organized to perpetuate the revelation, is the only legitimate authority to teach it to all ages and to all nations. This teaching order, this sacerdotal power, is assuredly the only agency that could perpetuate the revelation, deposited with it, without error. For, waiving the question of the *possibility* (mark the word) of any other order wresting this deposit of faith from the divinely appointed one,—waiving this, still no other order has security from error in teaching the faith, even if they could acquire its deposit. The divinely appointed order of priesthood is infallibly secured from error in perpetuating the faith, so far as the word and promise of God can secure it; and the Catholic can conceive of nothing safer than such security. The word of promise to it is, that its divine Founder was with it always, to the end of the world; that his Spirit would abide with it to comfort it, to bring all things which he had revealed to it to its remembrance, and to guide it into all truth; and that the gates of hell should not prevail against it. These promises clearly establish the will and the design—the divine purpose—that the truths revealed

should be perpetuated to all ages. There can be no doubt of this. And they, with equal clearness, establish the will and the design—the divine purpose—to be, that the sacerdotal order then organized to perpetuate it, was to teach it to all ages; for the command is to no other, neither are the promises to any other. And if it was the design that this revelation should be transmitted to all nations and ages, it certainly was the further design of our Saviour that it should be transmitted in its original purity and with all the force of its original obligations; in other words, the last priest who shall teach the doctrines of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, in the order of perpetuity, just before the consummation of the world, will teach to men with all the authority and certainty that St. Peter taught on the day of Pentecost, or that the council of Jerusalem taught the faith to the original churches. Reason teaches, that if this be not so, the divine idea and intention of perpetuity is destroyed. And the moment that the perpetuity of the idea and the fact of the revelation are once destroyed, the revelation is lost forever. Neither can it be recovered without a new revelation. This results from the nature of things, as reason deliberately teaches. But whether Jesus

Christ adopted means to *perpetuate* the idea and facts of his revelation, in accordance with the nature of men or not, the *fact is so*, that he did constitute a sacerdotal order to preserve and perpetuate it. That the functions of this order, in the execution of their sacred office, were in agreement with the teachable character of human nature, reason will not doubt; for he would not institute, for the enlightenment of man and his adaptation for eternal communion with himself, a mode of teaching which was at war with the nature to be taught. This is self-evident from reason; and it is, hence, alike self-evident that there is no abasement of reason when it sustains faith in the reception and practice of the truths divinely revealed.

But it is a *fact*, at all events, that Jesus Christ constituted a sacerdotal order to teach (perpetuate) his revealed religion. And whether the functions of this order—in the execution of its sacred office—were in exact accordance with the teachable character of human nature or not; still it is manifest that they were constituted to teach truth, and not error; that is, to teach—perpetuate infallible truth as revealed, and not any modification of it, whether it were an essential or an indifferent modification. Nothing can be more surely

affirmed by reason, than that, when God established a Church to teach all nations, he constituted it to teach assuredly, without any mixture of falsehood, the *very* revelation he deposited with it and commanded it to perpetuate, or teach to all nations to the consummation of the world. It is amazing to suppose that he could constitute a church to teach falsehood, or be instrumental in the perpetuation of that vice, by *varying* in any manner the revealed facts. It is equally amazing that any reasonable being should believe that God constituted any church to teach any *indifferent* and *non-essential* truth, as revealed by him to man for his instruction, to attain eternal life. If reason and common sense can give us higher assurance of one fact than another, it is of the truth asserted in these last propositions. This is the faith of the Church, and those who deny her faith on this subject she cannot allow to be the true representatives of either reason or common sense. And while she maintains the infallible truth with intolerant rigor, she maintains with equal intolerance that she is upholding the true relations which her divine Founder established between faith in a supernatural revelation and reason and common sense in the natural order. She asks no submission of these, but

she demands of them, as their most rational act, that when God reveals *a fact*, they do not invade the province of faith and coerce her to discredit the revelation, *because* they do not grasp its rationale according to their preconceptions of what would be a rational act in the Supreme God. For the fact must be true, whether these faculties of the human mind comprehend its mysteries or not. The antecedent probabilities, therefore, are, that when God, in the fulness of time, would reveal a religion or system of faith, and would institute sacraments fitted to instruct and redeem the soul of man from its fallen condition and restore it to its true relations to its Creator, and so prepare it for a happy immortality, that he revealed for this purpose only essential and infallible truths. The means to the end designed, which was to restore man to his true spiritual relations to the supernatural world and its Supreme Father, must rest alone in the judgment of God, and not in the preconceptions of the reason which man uses in his fallen state. Man has lost his true relations to God and the reason of God; it will be soon enough for him to talk about the philosophy (as he chooses to call it) of these relations, when he shall have been in some degree restored to his true position by

the only mode of restoration. When Jesus Christ made the revelation and commanded it to be taught to all nations, and instituted sacraments to accompany the teaching, as a portion of the revealed faith, it is evident that he would commission the sacerdotal order to teach the *supernatural* truth revealed, and gave them no authority to teach the thoughts and opinions, and science (if you will) of their natural reason and uninspired common sense. He could not reveal these, for they were already known. He could not instruct the sacerdotal order to teach them as revelation, for they were not. And, moreover, it is *a fact of reason* (which is always in the nature of a deduction) that the revelation was made and commanded to be taught, *because* natural reason and uninspired common sense were unfit to instruct and redeem the soul from its ruined spiritual condition, and restore it to its true relation to the Father of the supernatural world, and thereby prepare it for a happy immortality. Reason further teaches that the measure of the obligation of the human race to a divine revelation, is not its own strength, but this measure is the scope of the revelation commanded to be taught. This, and not the strength of reason, intellect, judgment—all sense and capacities teach us,

must be the measure of obligation and duty. To deny any of these statements is to deny the ability of God, in mercy to man, to do any thing above his experience and preconceptions, combined with his powers of reason. It is to limit God in organizing a religion to restore man to his true spiritual relations to the supernatural world, which he had so fatally lost, so to act as not to conflict with our antecedent notions of what is consistent with his mercy, and ability, and sagacity. Thus arraigning God is not simple atheism—it is surely blasphemous in the extreme. Reason teaches no such madness: she always demands that all the natural powers of man yield implicit faith and obedience to a supernatural revelation. The fundamental error of the rejecters of the faith the Church teaches is in opposing the power of reason to the rights of faith, and then opposing *natural* reason to *supernatural* revelation. This may, in all humility, be said to be a definition of all heresy. And upon this mistake, the rejecter of the faith concludes that when God's revelations are superior (above) to any capacities of comprehension and power of rational analysis which he possesses, they are false; that they are not to be believed, *because* contrary to his reason and common sense. This

is the same thing as to deny the supernatural altogether, and is therefore, in its analysis, atheistical. It is just this: it is, as a fundamental to faith, elevating our reason and common sense upon an equality with God's reason and common sense (reverently and humanly speaking), and then disputing with him His truth whenever it does not correspond to our preconceptions and notions. And the Church, so far from admitting this, and the principle of this, to be reason, reproves it with unsparing energy as utter madness. For she knows, what reason also knows, that the moment the *natural* is made the standard of the *supernatural*, that moment also is the principle established by which all revelation is not only disproved, but made impossible. Revelation is useless if such be the fact; and if useful, it can never be established with such a standard, at once, for its supernaturalness and infallibility. No fact in the natural order is disproved because its reason is not understood. No logician can pretend to any such rule of evidence concerning the veraciousness of facts. Whoever will object to the existence of a fact because he is ignorant of its reason (its philosophy), will, on his own principle, disprove all truths the reasons of which he does not understand, but which other men,

of superior learning, experience, and cultivation, do fully comprehend by their reason or philosophy. It is thus seen that the rule is one of supreme absurdity, and not a canon of reason at all. It is destructive of all reason superior from any cause to the reason of him who makes the canon the rule of his faith and the measure of his credence. And it is hardly to be supposed that the sublimest natural reason will not admit that the reason of the eternal God (so, and humanly speaking) is not superior to his. And this brings to the understanding the vivid madness of natural reason claiming even to exercise a philosophical jurisdiction over a supernatural revelation. The supernatural is a sphere of life and reason out of, above, beyond—incomprehensibly—the sphere of natural reason and its life. It is doubtless true that the reasons or philosophies of things—of facts—existing in the supernatural order, are incapable of being generally, if at all, communicated to the natural understanding in the natural order. And it is only such facts, existing in that order, as concern our relations to the supernatural world, that are revealed or communicated at all. There are, most surely, unimaginable facts, glorious and inconceivably splendid, existing in the supernatural world,

which, as naked facts, cannot be communicated to us, because their inexpressible grandeur would overwhelm our littleness.* Nay, they are upon us, and around us, and we are too diminutive to perceive them.

The canon of credence we are discussing is thus seen to be at fault in every department of every order to which it may be applied. The promise to the Church in the commission, by its divine Founder, to be with her all days, even to the consummation of the world; and that other promise, "I will send you another Comforter, even the Holy Ghost, to abide with you forever, and to guide you into *all* truth, and to bring to your remembrance *all* things whatsoever I have said unto you," will be annulled by this most fallacious standard. Are these promises of God? Has the Church the pledge of his infallible word, that he will be with her as her GUIDE AND REMEMBRANCER, while she teaches all nations, even to the end of the world? She knows she has. And reason affirms that this pledge is the surest, the most infallible, she can by possibility receive to assure faith of every fact. Reason cries out and demands that she and common sense be not used to contradict the plain word

* 2 Corinthians, ch. xii.

of God revealed to the Apostles. Reason affirms that she is that element of the soul, together with all other of poor humanity's powers, which revealed truth was designed to enlighten, purify, and chasten in its darkness and debasements, and to strengthen, through faith, in its weakness. And is she to discredit the sublime revelation? The reasoning of that intellect, however profound, and the judgment of that common sense, however grasping, which could come to such a conclusion, would surely be a counsellor as unwise as unsafe.

We hence conclude, upon the purest reason and the most chastened common sense, that all the probabilities are, that the religion revealed was free from all mixture of error, and that the sacerdotal order to whom was committed its teaching—perpetuation—have the promise of the blessed Jesus himself, limited and confined to their order, that he will be always with them as a guide and remembrancer; that the gates of hell cannot prevail against the guide, to mislead it or to blot out the remembrance of all the things committed to their keeping. Reason teaches that the promises are as sure now as they were the day the pledges were made; and that faith may trust them with all the assurance with which she

received them at the instant they were given. The Church believes on the authority of her Divine Founder's WORD, which is an anchor for human reason, that she is an infallible teacher. And she feels a perfect assurance that reason teaches that Christ would organize no other Church to teach his Word than an infallible one, because he would not organize a teacher to mislead reason herself. He was under the highest obligations and necessities (humanly speaking) to organize no other, for the very reason that reason would be misled if one were organized which could teach error. His faithfulness to his word of promise, therefore, *required* him to consecrate an order of infallible teachers, *because*, if the sacerdotal order, to whom he committed the keeping of his word, could err in teaching it, then indeed was his promise *false*. But reason, which credits the promise, denounces the conclusion as abhorrent; and that sort of reason which discredits the promise, we hold no argument with in the present essay. As soon as the sacerdotal order began to teach error, so soon his promise was void—failed. As soon as it failed to teach "*all things*" whatsoever he had commanded, the order not only violated the command, but he violated his promise. These are conclusions of reason, upon the

premises that the Church is fallible in her teaching, as certain as they are abhorrent in their nature to every sentiment of faith which the Church and her devout children cherish for the word of God. The children of the Church rely with undoubting confidence, with a holy, unfaltering trust, which no terrors shake, no blandishments seduce, upon her teaching as the infallible truth; and this faith they cherish as strict reason and pure common sense, *because* it is the province of these to demand an infallible guide, and to importune faith to believe whatever *facts* God reveals.

SECTION V.

WHAT DID THE SACERDOTAL ORDER—THE APOSTLES—TEACH? BY WHAT AUTHORITY? WITH WHAT INTOLERANCE TO INNOVATION; AND WITH WHAT RIGOROUS CONSISTENCY, AND HENCE ESPECIAL EXCLUSIVENESS? THE POSITION OF NATURAL REASON IN RELATION TO THE TEACHING OF THIS SACERDOTAL ORDER.

WE are thus brought to the question, what faith did the sacerdotal order teach, and what institutions did they establish? It is obvious that this is a plain matter of simple *fact*. No amount of human *reason* can attain to it or fathom it. All the combined powers of the

mind, by simple and original exertion, could not discover the revelation which God had to present it. The reason is plain: the problem sought was not of the order of natural reason, nor of the order of human intelligence. The solution sought is, we have said, a plain matter of simple fact, but of the *supernatural order*. Its order, character, sphere of residence, are superhuman. Human reason cannot reveal it; because, if it could, human intelligence, human reason, not God, would reveal the fact. And the most heated devotee of reason will not claim for her such absolute and supernatural power as to be capable of revealing *facts* from God. He did reveal supernatural facts *to* reason and all the human mind. But reason never could usurp the authority of the the Almighty, and evoke from him his secret counsels and promulge them to herself. If both reason and common sense teach us, with the utmost assurance, the truth of any natural or spiritual fact or proposition, it is this they so teach. So we are brought back to the original question: What plain matters of simple fact did the Apostles, the sacerdotal order, teach? Their commission instructs them as follows: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name

of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them *to observe* all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I AM with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen." It is seen that on the face of the authority there are no dogmas of faith specified (written out or recorded) which the Apostles were to teach. These things which were commanded to be taught were TRADITIONARY REVELATIONS which had *before* been communicated to the Apostles. They may, with the perfect propriety of a just definition, be called "Apostolic Traditions," which the sacerdotal order were commanded to teach. And so is the fact in relation to the observances they were to teach. These observances, whatever they were, were traditions before revealed; their existence consisted in tradition, and so we may call them, without any offence to their nature or the proprieties of speech, "Traditionary Apostolic Observances."

It is thus seen, that when the holy Catholic Apostolic Church was organized by her divine Master, and the sacerdotal order constituted to teach the truths deposited with it, that ALL OF ITS FAITH, THE ENTIRE MASS OF ITS DOGMAS, WERE TRADITIONS. The faith and observances of the gospel were traditions

at the moment of the birth, creation, organization of the Church of Jesus Christ. And that these traditions might be kept pure, and be purely transmitted, through all time, to all nations, was the very purpose of constituting the sacerdotal order to teach so far as reason, at least, is informed. And a *supernatural* means was provided by the blessed Jesus to preserve purely and transmit exactly the apostolic traditions and observances, which were *supernatural* revelations. The first means he so provided is written upon the face of the divine commission, and consists in his perpetual personal presence, body, soul, and divinity, in his Church: "Lo I Am with you always, even unto the end of the world." His personal and perpetual presence in his entire being, in his "I Am," therefore in his body, soul, and divinity, ought to satisfy reason that it was, is, and ever will be, impossible to corrupt these apostolic traditions by interpolations and changes in the dogmas of faith and sacramental observances. The Church is thus secured against what may be called active or positive error. Can she, by forgetting any of the apostolic traditions and observances, negatively or positively err? The personal dwelling of Christ with his Church ought to secure it against this form of error.

But the *fact* is not left to inference, which is an act of reason. Inference is excluded, and so reason is excluded, in the examination of truth in this instance. For we read in St. John's Gospel, ch. xiv., v. 12, 16–26, as follows: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me, the works that I do he shall do also; and greater than these shall he do; because I go unto my Father." "And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may *abide with you forever*." "These things have I spoken unto you, being yet present with you. But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, HE SHALL TEACH YOU ALL THINGS AND BRING ALL THINGS TO YOUR REMEMBRANCE, WHATSOEVER I HAVE SAID UNTO YOU." So that we see the Church is infallibly secured against passive or negative error in the keeping and teaching the apostolic traditions and observances. But the Church is still further secured. The security she has thus far is alone as to matters of simple fact. But the divine mind, foreseeing that the Church, in defining (declaring their nature and the limits—extent—of their belief) the dogmas of the apostolic traditions, after the lapse of ages, would (at least seemingly) be under the necessity of using facts of reason

in connection with her investigations of the divine truths contained in these traditions—the divine mind, we say, provided an infallible security against error here, if ever the Church was, or shall be, brought to the test. If the Church ever did use a fact of reason (humanly speaking) in investigating and defining the apostolic traditions committed to her keeping, or ever shall do it—she did, and she will, use it with infallible correctness and certainty. She has the word and promise of God that she did and that she will; and these are sure guarantees and infallible certainties. This promise is well stated in St. John's Gospel, ch. xvi., ver. 7–14: "Nevertheless I tell you the truth; it is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart I will send him unto you. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of Truth, is come, HE WILL GUIDE YOU INTO ALL TRUTH; for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak; *and he will show you things to come.* He shall glorify me; for he shall receive of mine and shall show it unto you." The Church, then, is secure against active or positive error; she is secure against passive or negative error; and she is also secure against error in stating a fact of reason

connected with the necessary investigation and definition of the apostolic traditions and observances in the fulfilment of the commission. Now, then, let us repeat the question: What plain matters of simple fact did the Apostles, the sacerdotal order, teach, in pursuance of the commission which commanded them to teach and observe the apostolic traditions? An examination of the commission gives an answer to the question. They taught "all things whatsoever he had commanded them." It is not the purpose of this essay to show that this or that dogma of the faith which the Church teaches to her children was revealed to the Apostles, to be by them, and their successors in office, taught to the world. This we leave the sincere inquirer to ascertain from other sources, which are abundant and readily to be found, whenever he chooses to make an examination for himself. It is the object of this production to show the harmonious relations between the divine faith, which the Church teaches, and natural reason, and to exhibit to the popular mind that the faith of the Church does not crush reason or usurp its authority. With only this object in hand, it is not proposed to show—except incidentally and under illustration—that any one dogma of faith which the Church has

always held, from the day of the commission till now, was among the "all things" Christ revealed to the Apostles during his preparation of them for the sacerdotal order, and at his ascension commanded them to teach as apostolic traditions, "to all the world," to the end of time. Our mode of treating the question makes this explanation necessary.

As the line of thought has been interrupted by the explanation, we repeat the question: What plain matters of simple fact did the Apostles teach? The answer is, all things whatsoever Christ *had* (before that) commanded them. And as the mysteries of the Immaculate Conception of his Mother, his Conception, his Sacred Humanity, his Resurrection and Ascension, were some of the necessary elements of his teaching, it is very clear their teachings were of facts which belonged to an *order* to which reason did not belong. This was a supernatural fact lying at the foundation of all their dogmas, and sacraments, and observances. But this fact, though revealed, when established by competent testimony, did not usurp the authority of reason; for reason has no authority to say what shall or shall not be revealed from the supernatural order to the natural order. The revelation, then, was no usurpation: it merely presented

to reason *a new fact* from *a new order*, which lay entirely beyond the domain of reason; and a fact she never could have known otherwise than by a revelation from the *supernatural order*, to which the revealed fact belonged, and from which it came to enlighten reason, but not to crush it. It is manifest that every fact which reason knows through faith, by a revelation from the supernatural order, is so much additional enlightenment and extension of her knowledge. Revelation, as a fact, and of a fact, is an extension of knowledge, and not an abolition of reason. Those Christian sects who reject the faith of the Church on the teachings of their human reason, are cordially entreated to review their lessons of reason, and to examine the truth of this position in passing their review. We address this entreaty to professed Christians; to atheists it is not addressed: it takes another line of argument to reach them.

In teaching "all things whatsoever" which Christ commanded them, the Apostles taught "one Lord, *one faith*, one baptism" (Ephes. iv. 5). And they so taught this with rigorous exclusion and the utmost intolerance of any innovation. They allowed no variation from the faith, but required their teachings of the apostolic traditions to be implicitly

and exactly followed and obeyed. They were careful and exact, and authoritative, even in the very *form of the words* in which the dogmas of faith were communicated; and they required their successors, as they instituted them, "to hold fast to this form of sound words" by which faith was communicated. We cite on these propositions, indifferently, these written scriptures: In an epistle written A. D. 65, thirty-two years after the crucifixion of the blessed Saviour, it is said, "Hold fast the *form* of sound words which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus. That good thing which was committed unto thee, keep by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us." (2 Tim. i. 2, 3.) "Thou, therefore, my son, be strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus, and the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." (2 Tim. ii. 1, 2.) In an epistle, written A. D. 59, twenty-six years after the crucifixion, we read: "Be ye followers of me, even as I am also of Christ. Now I praise you, brethren, that ye remember me in all things, *and keep the ordinances*, as I delivered them unto you." (1 Cor. xi. 1, 2.) "As they went through the cities, they delivered them the *decrees* for to keep, which

were ordained of the Apostles and elders which were at Jerusalem. And so were the churches established in *the* faith and increased in number daily." (Acts xvi. 4, 5; A. D. 54, and 21 years after the crucifixion.) In A. D. 59, the Corinthians are told: "Wherefore, I beseech you, be ye followers of me. For this cause have I sent unto you Timotheus, who is my beloved son, and faithful in the Lord, who shall bring you into remembrance *of my ways, which be in Christ, as I teach everywhere in every church.*" (1 Cor. iv. 17.) It is said, in an epistle written A. D. 54, twenty-one years after the crucifixion: "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the *tradition* which he received from us." (2 Thess. ii. 6.) In an epistle written A. D. 90, and fifty-seven years after the crucifixion, it is said: "He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ (what he taught) he hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed; for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds." (2 John, 9, 10, 11.) In 2 Thessalonians ii. 15, written A. D. 54, twenty-

one years after the crucifixion, the Apostle says: "Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the TRADITIONS which ye have been taught, whether by word or our epistle." In the epistle to the Galatians, written A. D. 58, and twenty-five years after the crucifixion, the Apostle says: "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach unto you any other gospel than that which we have preached unto you, let him be *accursed*." We might quote indefinitely, but these are enough to maintain, most fully, the point we have cited them to maintain.

The Church's intoleration of innovation has, in all ages, been a prominent feature in her character, and always chief in the list of accusations against her. Only by this intolerance can she preserve her being, and the Word of God, guaranteeing her perpetuity. She *is* the spiritual state of the world. She is *to be* the spiritual state of the world, to the end of time. But if she were to tolerate any abolition of, or innovation upon, her constitution, which is her faith, and the immediate gift of God, she would cease to be the spiritual state of the world instantaneously. She has not, she will not change. She cannot change. She will allow no one to teach, within her bosom, any change. She was as ready to repulse and

excommunicate Simon Magus, Cerinthus, Hymenæus, the Nicholaits, Ebion, Menander, Basilides, Saturninus, and the Nazareans, in the first century; the Cainists, the Elxai, the Millenarians, the Gnostics, Carpocrates, the Adamites, Valentinus, Cerdo, Marcion, Theodorus the banker, Theodorus the tanner, Heraclion, the Ophites, Marcus and Colorbasus, Tatian and the Encœralites, Bardesanes, Montanus, Priscilla and Maximilla, Hermogenes, Apelles, Praxes, Seleucus, Hermias, Artemas, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, in the second century; and the Rebaptizers, the Noetians, Privatus, Berillus, the Arabici, Novatian, the Sabellians, Paul of Samosata, the Origenists, Manes, the Hieracithæ, Valens, Felicissimus, Angelica, the Apostolici, Nepos, and Coracion, in the third century, as she was ready to repulse and excommunicate the several hundred forms of heresies which have arisen since the close of the fifteenth century. It has occurred to the writer, that if any one of ordinary attainments would take Butler's Lives of the Saints, and turn to the collection of events in the history of the world, embraced in the chronological index of that remarkable book, he might, by the help of this index, construct an argument *of fact*, so to speak, by the simple process of *elimi-*

nation—an algebraical argument, proving, beyond any doubt, that the Church teaches to-day what she has ever taught. For as each heresiarch successively arose, in each successive age, and broached his errors, the Church examined them by the standard of her divinely revealed faith, condemned them, and excommunicated those who adopted them as corrupters of the truth, which she had always held.

In this way the very heresies are forced to establish the original and ever-abiding faith of the Church. And this by a double process: First, the Church, in the process of condemnation and excommunication, necessarily made an indestructible mark of the truth she maintained, as well as the errors she condemned: Secondly, the heretics, in their attacks upon the Church and resistance to the truth, as taught by her, necessarily made another indestructible mark as to what the Church believed and taught. Hence, by the simple process of eliminating these heresies from the Church, the truth, as always maintained, would be securely established. Well, then, supposing—not asserting, at present—that the Apostles, in obedience to the command of the commission, taught that the Blessed Virgin conceived of the Holy Ghost and was at once a virgin and a mother; that God was

clothed in human flesh, taken from his ever-virgin mother; that he was born in a stable; was really and truly God and man, in the one person of Jesus Christ; that he was crucified *in fact*, and not only in *appearance* as the Basilides and his followers said—supposing that the Apostles taught all these, and many more mysteries of faith, then the Church can prove all the enumerated mysteries and all the others she has always held, by the heretics and heresies she has condemned for denying, and humanizing, and rationalizing her dogmas and observances into crude humanities. So it can be done, for any heretic and heretical doctrine, from Simon Magus to the prophet of the Mormons. But if the Apostles did teach these sublime mysteries of faith, did they, in so doing, impose upon reason, crush its authority, and dethrone it from any of its rightful power? If they did, they instituted an antagonism between divine faith and natural reason. But it is manifest that they instituted none such; they taught the revealed facts, and it is the highest province of reason to credit a fact. If reason, in her rightful supremacy, have a higher prerogative than another, it is this one of yielding credence to a fact. In her own order, which is the natural order, reason may or may not exercise

supremacy over faith, and discredit a fact which she cannot comprehend, and the philosophy of which she cannot understand. I by no means admit that she may thus discredit a fact in her own order. But when a fact is revealed to her from the supernatural order, by a supernatural agent (the fact and revealer being beyond her order), which fact originates with a power and in a philosophy out of her sphere of action, and of course above her comprehension, then the chiefest supremacy of reason is at once to yield credence to the fact and obedience to its nature and behests. To refuse credence in such a case, *because* of incomprehension, would not be an act of reason, but an act of insanity. The sovereignty of reason, in this case, consists entirely in excluding delusion and mistake, and so satisfying herself that the revelation is real—is a fact, shown to her by a *supernatural* power; and when delusion and mistake are excluded, then her chief supremacy and noblest obligations are to believe the fact and conform to the duties it imposes. To make her comprehension of the nature and authority of the *order* revealing, and her understanding of the necessity and philosophy of the fact revealed, the measure of the credence to be yielded, would be not only an unreasonable act, but

one of rank absurdity. Reason, in believing and practising revealed truth, would not only not sacrifice herself, but would fulfil the most rational duty her supremacy could impose upon her for her own safety and well-being —provided the revelation concerned them.

We have thus shown, generally, that the sacerdotal order, the Apostles, taught "all things whatsoever" Christ had commanded, *before* he gave them the catholic commission to teach all nations, for all time; and we have shown the position and relation of reason to this teaching. That supremacy consisted, we see, in this: When the sacerdotal order entered upon their mission, and taught all things commanded, as facts revealed to them by the God-man, Jesus Christ—the chief supremacy of reason was to believe and adore, without regard to her powers of comprehension, in her order, which is the natural.

We have not entered upon, and do not intend to enter upon, an inquiry as to what were the specific dogmas of faith the Apostles taught, and the actual institutions they established; because these do not come directly within the range and purpose of this essay, which, as before said, is simply to establish the harmonious relations between divine revelation and natural reason. A dis-

belief in this most rational doctrine is a great misfortune to all who entertain the disbelief. It is ruinous to their hopes, if they have any, of immortal happiness, and is destructive to the purest pleasures of even their natural understandings. It shuts up the entrance to the gates of the most refreshing consolations, both of faith and reason, in the natural order.

The opinion that the Church teaches a faith which enslaves the understanding is as fallacious now as when the polished Greeks scoffed at the doctrines as foolishness, and the cultivated Romans shed oceans of Christian blood to extirpate a faith which they alleged dethroned reason and their gods at once. We think, in the sequel, that this will appear so clearly, that no candid, earnest inquirer will ever again lay this charge against the infallible Church. If the charge could be made good, then, indeed, it would be a well-founded objection to the tenets of her faith—requiring very clear evidence that reason and faith are incompatible, and that the former must succumb, without demur, to the dictates of the latter; but as it is a fatal mistake, as all who will scrutinize her doctrines must confess, we reverentially entreat for the canons of the Church a careful and

honest examination. And may we kindly ask the reader to go with us while we, with profound regard for his judgment, and even with deferential respect to his prejudices, calmly, fearlessly, without vituperation, and free from all hatred, unfold the truth we have undertaken to develop?

SECTION VI.

WHAT IS THE EVIDENCE OF WHAT THE SACERDOTAL ORDER TAUGHT, AND THE INSTITUTIONS THE APOSTLES ESTABLISHED? AND HOW SHALL THIS EVIDENCE BE INVESTIGATED?

THESE inquiries, of course, are propounded to men who believe that Christ commissioned a sacerdotal order, then consisting of his immediate Apostles. To these he had *before* revealed "all things whatsoever" they were to teach, and to them, in the commission itself, he gave the infallible promise of his WORD that he would abide with them forever; and he also promised to send the Holy Ghost to guide them into all truth, and to bring to their remembrance "all things whatsoever" he had revealed for their instruction in the apostolic traditions, and through them for the instruction and guidance of their successors

in office, to teach all nations, for all time. We have just seen that when the sacerdotal order was constituted to teach the truths deposited with it, that all of the faith, the entire mass of dogmas, were traditions; that it so appears in the very terms of the commission itself. The teaching order were to act by bringing to the knowledge of all nations the facts contained in these traditions, which were revelations from Jesus Christ, before delivered to the saints, or sacerdotal order. And their special duty was to teach, to perpetuate, these traditions, consisting of these revelations. The evidence, therefore, of what the Apostles did, exists in their acts and in the institutions they established; just as the evidence of what our government, or any government, teaches, exists in the acts and institutions of the government.

If we desire to know what our government has taught concerning the rights and obligations of its citizens, we examine its acts. If these have been uniform and unvarying, we perceive that there has been no change, but that the government has always spoken one uniform language on the subject investigated; but if the acts of the government have been changing, capricious, and not uniform, we then perceive and can specify the

changes in their extent, in their character, and in their number. It is thus that the authoritative legislation (teaching) of a state may be known, without any doubt, in all its vicissitudes. This authoritative legislation, and the received authorized commentaries (judicial decisions) upon it, must fully instruct us in the teaching of any government, in which letters are known, concerning the power and authority of the government itself, and the rights and obligations of the governed.

Now in that spiritual state, or government, known as the Church, there was always a knowledge of letters; and for long ages she monopolized this knowledge. And in every age her children have been first in thorough scholarship, first in science and art. And even unto this very day, the devout student of the fine arts, who devotes himself exclusively to his mistress, is as sure to find his way to Rome, to refine and fit him for a worthy espousal, as is the devout son of the Church who devotes himself exclusively to the service of his holy Mother. Both the artist and son of the Church long for nothing so much as to pour out their devotions into the lap of a common mother—the patron alike of arts, science, genius, and the foster-mother of all her devout children, who come to her to in-

crease in faith, hope, and charity, at the altars of St. Peter. Hence, to investigate what the Church has always held, and in what duties and obligations she has always instructed her children, and to ascertain what power she has always retained, and what authority she has always exercised, and to know in what *precise manner* she has always exercised it, we must pursue the natural line of conduct we would follow to investigate the acts of the civil state.

We must look into the legislation (teaching-acts) of the fathers of the Church. We must scrutinize their epistles, their commentaries; their controversies with, and judgment upon, heretics, from Simon Magus to the Mormon Prophet; their homilies, their catechisms, their liturgies, their definitions or declarations of faith, and the decrees of their authorized councils. If this legislation—these acts—speak one uniform language as to the faith of the Church, in whatever part of the world they may be found, then they undoubtedly establish the catholicity (universality) of the teaching and belief of the Church. And they do more: they establish not only the belief (faith) of the Church, but they also establish the customs and practices of the Church under her creed. An unbroken custom of doing certain things in the practice of a faith, is surely the highest

and most secure evidence of the creed or belief itself. Institutions are so identical with creeds, that the analysis which would distinguish them would be much too subtle for solid and popular use. This is readily seen to be so in the civil state, when the governing power rules in accordance with the organic law and the will of the people. It must be so in the spiritual state, which is the Church; for it is an essential principle in the real nature of things, and lies at the foundation of all actions in which humanity is instrumental, in the spiritual state, that creed should illustrate observances, and that observances should illustrate creed. So it is plainly seen how easy it is to go up to the very altars of the Apostles and receive the faith. If in one step on our way up to those altars, we find *change*, variation, we have infallible proof of error, and we must turn back: we are not on the way of the apostolic traditions, which were traditions of Jesus Christ to the Church. But if there is perfect uniformity of faith and observances, with no change or variation in either; if the acts of the fathers of this universal Church teach—assert—that the creed they taught, and the customs they practised, were received from the Apostles, and had no other foundation than the faith and administration of the Apos-

tles, surely we arrive at exactly what the Apostles taught, and see the customs and ministrations they instituted. Reason certainly assures us thus far; and she stands erect, lofty, and unbending, in giving us the assurance. But the Apostles taught "all things whatsoever" Christ had commanded them, and so taught an immediate revelation from him. That the fathers taught this revelation with his authority and infallible verity, is in the highest degree certain. If in their acts, epistles, catechisms, homilies, liturgies, controversies, ministrations, dying bequests, the first saints and martyrs, who were fathers in the Church, leave a memorial of their creed, teaching, and customs, then it is the fulness of reason to credit these as the deliverances of the Apostles, made in obedience to their commission to teach all nations whatsoever they were commanded. For instance: St. Ignatius was bishop of Antioch, consecrated such by St. Peter, and he was a companion of SS. Peter, Paul, and St. John the evangelist. St. Polycarp was bishop of Smyrna, consecrated such by St. John the Evangelist, who calls him in the Apocalypse "the angel of the Church at Smyrna." He was the friend and companion of St. John and of St. Irenæus, the martyr of Lyons. Now, St. Ignatius was

arrested at Antioch and taken to Rome, and fed to lions in the amphitheatre, A. D. 107: St. Polycarp was martyred A. D. 166: and St. Irenæus was martyred A. D. 202. And each of these bishops and martyrs was in communion with—teaching the same faith and administering the same sacraments with, all their contemporaries, in all the world. If you will recur to the previous section, you will see the list of heresies which had arisen and had been eliminated from—condemned by, the Church before the death of St. Irenæus. Now glance again at the chronological relations those holy bishops and doctors sustained to each other and to the Church. St. Ignatius is the friend of Peter, Paul, and John. St. John and St. Ignatius are friends of St. Polycarp. And St. Polycarp stands between St. John and St. Irenæus, with one hand receiving the deposit of faith from St. John, and with the other depositing it on the altars at which St. Irenæus ministered. We entreat for these facts a patient, careful, and reflective consideration, to be made in the light of candor and with the aid of prayer. What do they import as the surest thing in the nature of all things, of all orders? Reason says that they give us the utmost assurance, absolute, unconditional knowledge, that all the faith, the entire

mass of dogmas, which constituted the apostolic traditions and the apostolic observances, which were the revelations of Jesus Christ that the sacerdotal order were organized to perpetuate, were taught and perpetuated in their purity down to the death of St. Irenæus, in A. D. 202.

It is not a possible thing for reason to credit—she cannot believe that St. Ignatius, St. Polycarp, and St. Irenæus did not teach the faith and administer the sacraments the Apostles taught and administered. Reason affirms, with all and with her utmost potentiality, that when we know what these doctors, and their contemporaries, and their immediate successors taught, that then we know, with the clearest precision and most undoubted certainty, what the Apostles taught as the revelation of the blessed Saviour. These men, who were going to martyrdom in its most horrid forms, for the faith, and who were excommunicating heretics for corrupting it, or teaching contrary to it, surely were not blind guides. It is as certain a thing as that there are now Catholics, that if these holy bishops of the Church and martyrs for the faith did not teach the traditionary revelations of Jesus Christ to the sacerdotal order, then no one else did. This is as certain as

time, and sense, and reason. And if they did not, then it is just as certain that all the faith—the entire mass of dogmas contained in the traditionary revelations which Christ commanded to be taught, had already been lost, and the gates of hell had already prevailed against the Church, and the promises of Christ had already failed. It would be against reason and common sense to come to any other conclusion. If this be denied, we must deny all means of proving the authenticity of the *written* gospels and epistles as distinguished from the acts of the fathers. For these same fathers, of whose acts—customs—we are seeking, gave to us the written Scriptures. They were the natural and necessary (mark the word, "necessary") custodians of these written Scriptures. These Scriptures had been written to the churches to which they were directed; and those which have no direction were written *for* certain of the churches, at the request of the saints and fathers. The churches to or for which they were written had, of course, the true and original Epistles and Gospels. The copies made from these were the real transcripts from the originals. By the force of these facts the fathers of the Church, in the council of Nice, A. D. 325, were enabled to determine, with

clear exactitude, what writings then afloat in the world, purporting to be original Scriptures, were genuine and what were false. And by the assistance of the Holy Ghost, in the same council, they were enabled to determine which Scriptures that were genuine were inspired and which were uninspired.

On these two principles that council stamped the seal of verity and inspiration upon the genuine and inspired Scriptures, which seal remained unbroken until the Reformation, when the Reformers excluded certain books from the canon, and were well nigh excluding several more. So we say that to deny to the Fathers what is claimed for them by the Church, will be to destroy all evidence of the authenticity of the written Scriptures. ("Written Scriptures;" the tautology is needful.) For the council of Nice is to be trusted, or it is not. If not, its determination is void and of no effect; and, as we have no other authority claiming to be valid, for what writings were and what were not genuine (leaving out the matter of inspiration), we are manifestly believing in Scriptures without any evidence (whether there be such or not), if we discredit the testimony of Nice. Belief without evidence is not an act of reason —it is an act of folly. But the voice of Nice

was the voice of the universal Church, assembled from every part of the Christian world, in that council. Her bishops had been the keepers of the true epistles and gospels; and all the Church had to do in that council, to identify genuine copies and to detect forged ones, was to make an act of simple comparison. If a copy agreed with the original, kept by the bishop of Ephesus, for instance, then such copy was genuine,—it was St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians; if the copy did not agree with the original, it was spurious,—it was not St. Paul's Epistle. Hence, an act of simple comparison, by the collective Church, who was the custodian of the real Scriptures, stamped the seal of verity on the genuine and the seal of falsehood on the spurious. And thus it was that the Church preserved from corruption and gave to the world the Scriptures, pure and free from all defilement. Now, every one of the three hundred and eighteen bishops in that council believed and taught what St. Ignatius, St. Polycarp, and St. Irenæus, and their contemporaries, believed and taught; so that either way we may readily ascertain what the Apostles taught: we may examine what the fathers of Nice taught, and hence conclude what Ignatius, Polycarp, and Irenæus, and the Apostles taught; or we may

examine the teachings of St. Ignatius and the others, and thus know what both the Apostles and the fathers of Nice taught. The fathers of Nice were not only the undoubted, but the undisputed, successors of the Apostles. Each one of all these fathers taught a certain faith and administered certain sacraments, as the faith and sacraments of the Apostles. This is what the Church teaches, and it is a simple matter of fact whether it be so or not. It can be decided by just consulting these fathers. Such consultation, the children of the Church say, will, by a uniform, universal *custom* of the Church, take us back from the fourth century, and the council of Nice, to the altars and ministrations of the Apostles. The Church believes that any other conclusion would be against reason, and contradictory to common sense, as exhibited in the institutions of mankind. And the Church knows that, beginning with the fathers of the fourth century, in the council of Nice, she can establish her present faith and institutions to be identical with theirs. She knows this as certainly as any well-informed man, who never has been at Rome or London, knows there are such cities. Her children, who have never been in Egypt, have no more assurance of the existence of the pyramids than they, thus,

have that their mother, the Church, teaches the faith of the Apostles, or than they have that the Church now in communion with its head, Pius IX., is the same Church which assembled at Nice in communion with its then head, Pope St. Sylvester. This, as we have said, is a simple fact, or it is not. It can readily be solved by an appeal to the traditions of the Apostles, their contemporaries, and their successors down to A. D. 325; and by the acts (traditions) of the same Church from A. D. 325 to the present time. Reason says so, and the rejecters of the Church's faith invest reason with a sort of undefined infallibility. And if the Church teaches what the Apostles taught, then whoever is present at her teaching is present at the very teaching they taught. Reason sanctions this, too, with whatever of irresistible power she possesses. Reason sanctions all this. But suppose she did not, and set up the plea of incomprehension. What then? Is she to appeal from the teaching of the Apostles as untrue, *because* their teaching is not in conformity with her decrees as to which is credible or incredible? If so, she can and must appeal from all supernatural revelation. The appeal denies all supernatural authority, and power, and order. But in denying supernatural revelation, power, and

authority, reason usurps a province and a sphere in which she has neither experience, nor authority, nor capacity to judge of what is credible or incredible; much less has she supremacy to decide. She is obviously assuming to make a reasonable decree upon a state of facts existing in an order of which she is utterly and supremely ignorant. And her own constitution teaches her this is not a legitimate exercise of her powers. For what reason is necessarily ignorant of, she cannot pronounce judgment upon, rationally. Now, in confirmation of the fathers of Nice, it must not be forgotten that from the days of the Apostles every bishop was in communion with every other bishop, and all in communion with the supreme Head of the Church. St. Ignatius, for instance, was in communion with all the other bishops of the world. Hence, if we know the creed he professed, and the sacraments he administered, we also know that of all other bishops. It is so now, and always was so; and it is thus that the catholicity of the Church has always been known and maintained. She never tolerated any innovation upon her faith, as has been shown in a former section, but sternly repelled from her communion every innovation and innovator. If she could not reclaim heretics,

she instantly cut them off from her communion. This is her exclusiveness now, and thus far she has been always intolerant and exclusive in all ages—she never has relented, nor never will.

We come now to another evidence of what the Church has always taught. She not only believed and taught the apostolic traditions, or the verbal dogmas of faith, revealed to her by her divine Founder, but, in obedience to the same traditions and the same revelation, she established certain institutions or perpetual standards of her ministration or action.

Before more than stating the fact, I desire to recur briefly to *the force of institutions to perpetuate facts*—to their efficiency in commemorating events. In illustration of the power and security there are in institutions to perpetuate a fact, let two prominent ones—the one ancient and religious, the other modern and political—be referred to. The religious institution referred to is the passover, instituted by Moses on the night when the first-born of man and beast in Egypt were stricken with death. (Exodus xii.) The Israelites were commanded to slay a lamb and sprinkle its blood upon their door-posts, to eat it whole, to eat it with bitter herbs and unleavened bread, with their loins girt, their

shoes on their feet, with their staffs in their hands, and to eat it with haste. And they were commanded to do so *forever*, at that season, as a perpetual memorial of the fact the institution was intended to commemorate. Now, if in any after age, no matter how remote or how near, any man had disputed the verity of the fact of the institution, would not the high priest, with all the sacerdotal order, together with all the children of Israel, have been able to confound the objector by the *unity* of the traditionary evidence—by the unbroken current of faith and practice from the time of Moses and Joshua? He would have been asked to point to the age and to the reign of the high priest in which the fabrication began. Reason would demand such a specification, accompanied by evidence of the least probable force. Any thing short of a direct statement as to when and by whom the innovation was made, would not be a reasonable allegation of a truth, under the circumstances. And the reason is obvious: without a positive statement of the kind, sustained by probable evidence, at least, the objector could urge nothing against the origin of the institution, and its faith, and its practice, ever since, save the general deduction of his personal reason, that it was untrue

as against reason in general. Yet this mode of reasoning is one universally adopted by those who reject the faith which the Church teaches her children. It is so remarkable for its violation of fact and logic, that we beg leave to restate the proposition: and we say, "without a positive statement of the kind, sustained by probable evidence at least, the objector could urge nothing against the origin of the institution and its faith and practice ever since, *save the general deduction of his personal reason, that it was untrue as against reason in general.*" This, we say, is a remarkable violation of both fact and logic: of logic, because, concluding from his personal reason to reason in general, is wholly unsound as a rule of inference. Better infer his own insanity, because opposed to the general reason. It is a violation of a fact, because the tradition is not opposed to reason in general: the general reason sustains it as both truth and reason. So that any man, from Moses to the crucifixion, who would oppose his general reason, unsupported by any specific fact, either revealed or unrevealed, to the universal faith and practice of all that period, of all the people of Israel, could never be regarded as a reasonable man. We now come back directly to the force of the unity of faith, as

seen in commemorative customs. We see that a denial of the custom, against the unbroken tradition, is not an act of reason or of fact.

But look at it from another point of observation; and on the other hand, suppose that Moses had organized no such institution as the passover, with its sacred rites and ceremonies, and some high priest, or some other "crafty priest," or some other crafty Israelite, had attempted, in some subsequent age, remote from or near to the Exodus, to organize the institution of the passover, to commemorate the long antecedent, but imaginary, event. What chance would the heretic have had to impose his fabrication for a reality upon all the people of Israel? The chief priests, the entire sacerdotal order, and all the people, would have said, "This is fiction, and not fact; falsehood, and not truth. It is manifestly and shamefully false, *because* neither we nor our fathers have ever seen or heard of this institution; we nor our fathers have celebrated no such event, annually, at this season of the year, with these forms, and ceremonies, and faith, since Moses led us out of Egypt. No high priest, with the sacerdotal order, has ever ministered, by sacrifices and offerings, in the celebration of any such anniversary: the traditions and institutions of our fathers, for

all time, prove this to be an absurd attempt at an impudent innovation." Reason thus plainly and irresistibly decrees, with all her capacities, concerning the innovation and heresy, supposed to be an impossible fact in the Jewish Church. The sacerdotal order, always jealous of innovation, because bound to keep the faith, would have crushed it at once. Every right-minded man in Israel would have aided the hierarchy to preserve the faith. But if, by any possible imagination, the fabrication could have been introduced, it would have produced debate, conflict, schism; and the records and traditions of these would have left *a mark in time*, from and by which all men who were disposed to discredit it could point to its introduction into the worship of Israel. The priests and patriots who resisted the introduction of the forgery, and the arguments used, and the blood spilled, if any, for the old faith, could all be specified; and so the arts, and stratagems, and policy, and violences, used to fix the imposition on the people, could, in like manner, be plainly shown. So that it is self-evident, almost, that it was alike impossible to disprove the institution after its organization, and to fabricate it and impose it upon the church and the people, as a fact, if it never were instituted.

And so we may say of that prominent institution of the Church, known as the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, which is celebrated every day, in every place where there is a priest and an altar. But of this presently.

The other institution referred to, and which is modern and political, as showing the force of institutions to perpetuate a fact, is the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the United States, on the fourth of July, seventeen hundred and seventy-six. If a party of men shall arise in the sixteenth century subsequent to its institution and perpetual commemoration, who shall assert that its annual celebration, as an institution to commemorate a fact, is a sham and a falsehood, what would all the children of America say? Undoubtedly they would point to the *unity* of the tradition and the unbroken current of authority, as an all-sufficient monument of the fact that it did commemorate the Declaration of Independence and the redemption of their fathers from colonial vassalage in A. D. 1776: that the monument was erected to perpetuate a real fact, and not a sham one. The children of our country will say to the infidel or heretic on that subject: if this be not so, you can point to the year, and the president, and the administration in which this monument was

erected—in which this institution was organized to perpetuate an assumed fact, which was not a fact in reality. You can name the very impostor who introduced the innovation. You can tell us the leading newspapers in which, and the leading mass meetings at which, and the deliberative assemblies through which, it was at first denounced. You can show us the pages of the public history of the country in which its falsehood is discussed and proved by previous monuments, which this assumed one could not displace and disprove; the previous monument standing, this one must be cast down as a forgery: all tradition proves that no such monument ever was erected to perpetuate such a fact. And so the people of the United States, in the event that their Declaration of Independence shall be commemorated annually, until the 4th of July, A. D. 3276, will know that their fathers did make the declaration 1500 years before, as certainly as if they had stood in the Continental Congress when it was first announced to the world.

Now let us apply the commemorative power of these two institutions, the Passover and the Declaration of our national Independence, to the greatest of all institutions under heaven, namely, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass in the infallible Church: its faith and mysteries

being an offering of the real body and blood of Christ, which is daily made in the daily ministrations of every church where there is a priest to make the offering and the sacrifice. This daily offering is as prominent in the ministration and life of the Church as the crucifixion is prominent as its foundation. Now suppose it to be a fabrication of some pope, bishop, or "crafty priest," or other person, in some age remote or near, but subsequent to the Apostles, and not one of the traditions revealed to them before the commission which Jesus Christ commanded them to observe! Suppose this! What then? When the innovator came with his innovation, what would the universal church have said to the heretical innovator, and what concerning the innovation? Reason affirms, without any doubt, that every bishop in the world (other than the fabricator of the corruption) would have arisen up, and, with one accord, would have anathematized the forgery and have excommunicated the author. Priests would have declaimed against it, councils would have condemned it, the works of controversial theologians would have been filled with its exposure, free-thinkers and infidel philosophers would have left their works full of sparkling ridicule at the violent contradictions to human reason the innova-

tion assumed, and finally, how the common sense of the world was taken captive by the absurdity. And the common histories of nations would have marked it as a curious era of imposition and credulity, and have specially noted the fact that the world had never heard of such doctrine from the death of Christ until the innovator came and succeeded in deluding the then entire Church, which the Saviour established. Is it not a manifest teaching of reason, that if in spite of the faith of the Apostles and the teaching of the fathers (which is impossible), a new and extraordinary faith, of wonderful mysteries, were thus imposed upon the Church, that her history would be examined, and the world be filled with books, saturated with the rage of the contest, which finally overcame "the faith once delivered to the saints?" Would not folio upon folio, filling closely packed libraries, be burdened with the extraordinary controversy? Any other supposition would certainly be contradictory to reason. Reason declares that it is impossible for such a matter to occur in the history of the Church and in the history of the world, and not leave any traces behind of the character which we have indicated, as following the fact. No more marked miracle is treasured up in the Church's

memory than this dead silence of church history and world history, would be, if the fact be so, that has been stated upon supposition. No such miracle has occurred among men, as would be this imaginary fact, if it were a reality. But all has not yet been indicated which proves the want of reason—the contradiction of reason in the supposition: many councils of the Church would have been called, and the records of their acts would be freighted with decrees on one side or the other. There would have been hundreds of sermons and as many hundreds of epistles by the fathers, and thousands of pastoral letters, and many dying bequests by saints, to mark the introduction and establishment of the heresy. And *all* the monuments of history would give us the name of the successful impostor, together with the names of his chief adherents, who destroyed the *old* and established the *new* faith, as faithfully as they record the names of heretics and their heresies from those of the first century to those of the nineteenth. Reason and common sense are as cheerfully, as solemnly appealed to to vindicate all these things. And reason and common sense affirm their consistency with themselves. And this being so, what is the teaching of reason concerning the origin and perpetuity of that institution

in the Church known as the holy sacrifice of the mass? It clearly, irresistibly, yes, *irresistibly*, teaches the faith of the Church, namely, that the holy sacrifice of the mass—the eucharistic sacrifice, with all its tremendous and influential mysteries and graces, *is an ordinance instituted by the Apostles*, in obedience to the command of Christ to go and teach all nations whatsoever he had commanded them—accompanied by his WORD OF PROMISE to be with them always, even unto the consummation of the world. Reason further teaches that, in the presence of this great mystery of the Church, we stand before an institution and ministration of the Apostles, which Christ revealed unto them to establish and to perpetuate to the end of the world.

Hence reason also teaches that in the presence of the *revealed fact* she has no *data*, no foundation, no experience, no promises, whatever, from whence to deduce a conclusion that Jesus Christ did not reveal it, and that the Apostles did not establish it. And this because the matter and the philosophy of a revelation are beyond her sphere of operations and power; and, therefore, in deducing a conclusion against it, she would be merely inferring a fact of reason from her own utter ignorance, which is absurd. For reason, from

ignorance, cannot infer either a truth or a reliable principle. This is stated to be not only reasonable and in keeping with common sense, but it is advanced as unflinching logic, which will sustain every revealed dogma and observance of the holy Catholic Church, against which all the batteries of supposed reason have been brought to bear.

Let this be studied—reflected on, honestly and candidly considered. Its force in vindicating a revealed truth will resist every shock that can be made upon it by any endowment of the human mind. There can be nothing more mad than for any agent to conclude, from premises which are beyond the sphere in which his capacities have any power or any means of operation, the rationality or irrationality of any principle which should govern the conduct or influence the judgment of a man of reason and common sense. If a reasonable man have a revelation, under these circumstances, reason clearly indicates that he must be guided by the command the revealed fact contains, instead of making his ignorance of its sphere and philosophy a rule for disobedience to its instructions. This, we think, is the teaching of reason.

SECTION VII.

The Province of Reason and the Province of Faith.

The last section brings us directly to the province of reason and the province of faith. The clear, simple facts, and the equally clear facts of reason it presents, develop the question and propound the demand: What is the province of reason and what is the province of faith? The answer is certainly prompt as to the empire of faith, in a matter of supernatural revelation; and that answer is, we must believe every fact revealed by God, without argument, question, or dispute. When, therefore, the Church teaches that natural or human reason cannot discredit any fact of divine revelation, she does not interfere with the rightful province of reason. And when she goes further, and instructs her children that the obligations which a divine faith imposes upon their lives and consciences, are duties from which they cannot escape and must implicitly discharge, because they are revealed, she neither abolishes nor in any manner restrains reason. The lawful operations of reason, in her own empire in the soul,

are in no wise embarrassed by the Church, when she instructs her children and the entire world to believe whatever God has revealed to her, through the Apostles, and through them has commissioned her to teach all nations, to the end of the world. Whatever faith she was commanded to teach as being contained in the apostolic traditions and observances committed to her by our blessed Saviour, when he said to the Apostles: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world. Amen."

Whatever faith the Church was commissioned to teach, as being the faith and observances thus commanded to be taught, she may—must—teach, and cannot thereby embarrass the lawful operations of reason in her own empire in the soul. This is self-evident to the reason of every man who acknowledges the supernatural power and supreme jurisdiction of the God of the Christian; for God would not command a system of faith to be taught to the world which would either abolish reason or embarrass its legitimate op-

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

erations within its own empire. Hence the question never is: what does reason comprehend? but it always is: what were the facts contained in the apostolic traditions which were commanded to be taught and observed to the end of the world?

And here let us digress long enough to state the time after our blessed Saviour's ascension, (the date at which) the several books of the New Testament Scriptures were written. St. Matthew wrote his gospel about eight years after the ascension. St. Mark wrote his about ten afterwards. St. Luke wrote his about twenty. St. John wrote his about sixty-three. The Acts of the Apostles contain an account of the first thirty years of the Church, and were written by St. Luke about ten years after his gospel, or thirty years after the ascension. (The council at Jerusalem was held A. D. 51.) The Epistle to the Romans was written twenty-four years after our Lord's ascension. The Epistles to the Corinthians was also written twenty-four years after his ascension. The Epistle to the Galatians was written twenty-three years after the ascension. That to the Ephesians twenty-nine, that to the Philippians twenty-nine, that to the Colossians twenty-nine, and that to the Thessalonians about nineteen years after the ascension. The

Epistles to Timothy were written about thirty-three years, that to Titus about thirty-three years, that to Philemon about thirty-one years, and that to the Hebrews about twenty-nine years after our Lord's ascension. St. James' Epistle was written about twenty-eight years, St. Peter's Epistles about fifteen years, St. John's Epistles were written about sixty-six years, St. Jude wrote his about thirty-three years, and the Apocalypse, or Revelations, was written about sixty-four years after our blessed Saviour's ascension. It is thus seen that the apostolic traditions and observances, that is, the entire mass of faith which the Apostles were commissioned—commanded to teach, was tradition, and preceded the written Scriptures of the New Testament from eight to sixty-six years.

To return from this digression, which we hope will shed a bright light upon the entire matter of this essay, allow us, kind reader, to gather up the thread of the argument, interrupted by the digression, by repeating a sentence preceding it. It is repeated, then: "Hence the question never is: what does reason comprehend? but it always is: what were the facts contained in the apostolic traditions which were commanded to be taught and observed to the end of the world?" And

in the investigation, in the comprehension, in the realization, of this question, the respective spheres of reason and faith, are as distinct from each other as the necessary element to sustain the life of a fish is distinct from the necessary element to sustain the life of man. The sphere of divine faith is in the *supernatural order*, and concerns matters of fact (the actual condition of things) in that order, while natural reason concerns matters of fact (the actual condition of things) in the natural order. It is a simple truism of the senses to assert the total distinction of the orders. The empire of divine faith never encroaches (never can) on the domain of natural reason. And the rightful empire of reason can never reach, can never attain, to the facts or condition of things which exist in the supernatural order; hence she cannot judge of, nor even assume any jurisdiction over, the nature of things and the credibility or the incredibility of facts which she cannot so much as discover, let alone comprehend. To do so would be to adopt, as the principle of her conclusions, that her ignorance and incapacities authorize her to infer facts of reason from both these deficiencies, which is in the highest degree illogical and irrational. Divine faith can never encroach upon any rightful province of reason,

for this faith is a firm belief in a real revelation of God. It may, for the purposes of this essay, be defined: "A theological virtue which consists in believing explicitly or implicitly all the truths God has revealed, without any doubt, on the veracity of God alone. It requires absolute certainty, objective as well as subjective. Where there is belief without objective evidence, certainly the belief is not faith, but mere opinion or persuasion. Mere subjective certainty, that is, an inward persuasion, even though it should exceed all actual doubt, would not be faith, unless warranted by evidence in which reason can detect no deficiency." (Brownson's Essays, p. 21.) Reason may be defined to be the actual relations perceived between the real objects of the mind's knowledge and comprehension; or it may be defined to be the power of the human mind to institute real comparisons between, and to make just deductions from, the objects which are actual facts (the true condition of things) presented to it, for its judgment, in the natural order, that is, within its own sphere of existence and operations. Beyond this all intelligence tells us she is not to be trusted. Every real fact which the human mind actually comprehends and fully understands, without any mistake, comes with-

in the sphere of reason; and when she judges the fitness of such fact to the constitution of natural things, she may be a proper, if not a supreme arbiter. But from the very constitution of reason and its organization in the human mind, however enlightened or unenlightened, it cannot be a proper judge of the nature and fitness of a divine revelation, to fulfil the purposes of God in making it to the intelligent objects to whom it is made; much less can she conclude against its reality, because of her ignorance and incomprehension of the philosophy of the supernatural. Every revelation is a *new fact* presented to the mind of man, and consequently must be an increase (extension) of knowledge. This no sane man will deny: it is self-evident to reason. How, then, can she conclude against the extension of her own knowledge as an abolition or abasement of her own authority? Must she do so because she cannot reach or comprehend the necessities and proprieties—the philosophy of the divine mind in granting the revelation? It has been seen that every revelation to God is a mercy to man. Reason, therefore, would not only conclude from her own ignorance against the truth and against mercy to her condition, but also against the extension of her own knowledge, by denying the new fact,

because she could not overcome her own incapacities and attain to the philosophy of the supernatural dispensation. Reason cannot, and she ought to know it, be a supreme arbiter of either the necessity or the nature of a divine revelation, because that revelation, *ex necessitate rei*, is beyond her sphere of action and observation. Divine truths are, in one sense, at least, revealed to man from necessity, which necessity consists in the entire impotency of reason to discover the facts revealed. If reason could explore the territory of the supernatural order, and there discover *new facts* and develop them to man, then, indeed, she might claim to be a supreme arbiter in the matter. But yet the claim might be as false as that of the savage, who never saw an implement of civilization, except in a visit of a few hours to a vast museum, filled with the most delicate and complicated astronomical instruments, with instruments for the construction of steam-engines, with instruments for raising the Crimean fleet, with instruments surgical and dental, who would assume to explain to his fellows of the wilderness, after his return to his lodge, the nature and uses of all his eye had sketched in a few hours of observation among civilized men. Hence, if natural reason had roamed over the realms

of the supernatural order, for a period of time, it is extremely probable that she would have come back very illy endowed with capacities to explain the philosophy of facts sketched by her vision during the visit. It is a thousand to one that she would have misconceived and grossly misunderstood every thing with which she was brought into contact and communion, unless some inhabitant of that supernatural order had been commissioned to instruct her. And if so, what madness to reject the instruction, for any cause. And here let us again repeat a frequent repetition, and one that cannot be too often repeated, that when reason deduces facts of reason from her own ignorance and incapacities, that she not only acts against herself, but she plays the part of the savage inflated with vanity at the sights he has seen, but which left him as ignorant as before. In as much as reason is utterly impotent to discover the truths revealed; that is, to make a divine revelation, she has no authority to make her incapacities articles of faith. That human reason cannot institute and divulge a divine revelation, is admitted to be self-evident; and to suppose, even, the contrary, is to imagine a contradiction in terms and things, and is an abolition of all the canons of reason's action, and is actually

to confound and destroy the basis of all knowledge. The incapacity of reason, then, to institute and develop a divine revelation, is surely a clear testimony of her inability to judge of its fitness in time and place, and the necessity and purpose of God in giving it the *form and substance* which he actually chose to give it. In what, then, consists the supremacy of reason? In crediting the fact revealed on the veracity of God alone. She is to take no other authority for the truth of the revelation. When she has ascertained the fact of a supernatural revelation, it is her highest duty to yield obedience to all it enjoins. Because she cannot comprehend the rationale of the form and substance of the revealed fact, she cannot, with justice to herself, deny the fact. Other forms and other substances might be more in accordance with her antecedent opinions and present persuasion of what would have impressed the human mind to yield the obedience required; yet all these preconceptions cannot reasonably dispute the fact. *That* stands against the world and all its prejudices, hopes, and logic. None of these can annihilate the fact. And they all are very fallible to base either a propriety or duty of heaven upon. To question the veracity of God *because* we cannot

fathom and measure what we call the philosophy of his revelation in the particular form and substance by which Jesus Christ gave it expression, is usurping authority in the supernatural order, and the throne, and power, and reason of the most high God himself. But this is not an act of reason; it is one of supreme folly and utter madness. We do not comprehend how he *spoke* a world into existence, yet this want of comprehension does not destroy the fact nor make it contrary to reason. It is a reasonable fact, nevertheless, at least in the consciousness of every real Christian; and it exists in spite of our incomprehension and our ignorance of its rationality, and in spite of our inability by any possibility to understand and explain it. Reason cannot explain *why* it was necessary that the door-posts of the Israelites in Egypt, on the night all her first-born were smitten with death, should be sprinkled with the blood of the paschal lamb, in order to the distinguishing of the house of an Israelite from the house of an Egyptian, so that the angel of God might pass over the one and enter the other to slay its eldest born. Yet the fact is not unreasonable—contrary to the reason of any Jew or Christian. If so, he has denied the faith. Reason is entirely incompetent to

explain the fact revealed: faith believes it on the veracity of God alone. The reason of that son of Jacob who, on that night of terror in Egypt, had concluded against *the fact*, would have paid the penalty of a dispute with his God, who had revealed the truth to Moses, and not to all the people. In this, as in all other revelations, the Church teaches her children that God reveals simply *a fact* or system of facts, and does not, as her accusers require, reveal its reason and common sense. The nature and philosophy of the fact is never revealed, unless its object or design be taken for these. Hence human reason cannot attain to these, however vigorously it may exert itself. This truth was distinctly stated to Moses, and by him announced, as a law to the people, when it was said, "The secret things belong unto the Lord our God; but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children forever, that we may do all the words of this law." (Deut. xxix. 29.) If an Israelite had asked Moses *why* it was necessary to sprinkle his door-posts with blood, for the discernment of God, who gave the command, and had, *because* the prophet could not explain its philosophy, deduced the conclusion that the revelation was a human invention, and Moses an impostor, such a

one would certainly have exceeded the authority of reason, and would as certainly have paid the penalty of his folly. Inevitable death would have been the portion of all the first-born of his house. And when the rejectors of the faith of the Church deduce like conclusions from like reasons against the mysteries of religion, revealed by Christ to his Church, are they not guilty of a like madness, instead of performing an act of reason? And may they not incur a like penalty for their disobedience? It is thus clearly seen how contrary to reason it is to impeach any revelation, any declaration of a supernatural fact by our Saviour to his Apostles, and by them taught to the world.

When the *fact* is revealed, it is not the province of reason to question its authority, *because* of her incomprehension. Neither ignorance nor incomprehension can blot from existence any existent fact, however insignificant; and much less can either wipe from the statutes of revelation those facts of such infinite import as our Saviour revealed to the Apostles and commanded them to teach to all the world. "Let God be true, but every man a liar," is the language of reason as well as of faith. All arguments which are constructed upon the principles of the accusers of the Church,

against the faith she teaches to her children, are manifestly as contrary to the substance of reason as they are contrary to the substance of faith. The principle of these arguments is, that whatever reason cannot understand and comprehend—analyze and square with her capacities—is necessarily untrue. And one of the conclusions involved in the principle, and flowing resistlessly from it, is, that human reason is a necessary limit upon the power of God; for it assumes that he cannot reveal any thing that reason cannot understand. Either as a fact or as a principle, this is false. It is a doctrine which no terms can characterize, let alone define.

It is held by a certain sect of heretics that no man of sense can believe a mystery. And this in defiance of man's own existence, and that of the world, and all its amazing furniture. Such men ought to explain to us the foundations of the earth and the hinges upon which the sun revolves. They ought to inform us what are the vital forces of our own being, and how they impel the blood from the heart along the currents of life. If God can create such magnificent mysteries in the natural world, it is surely against reason to conclude that he cannot reveal mysteries from the supernatural world. For if

there be a supernatural world, and a God and Father of it, he *can* reveal some of its facts, which would necessarily be mysteries. Every such argument is absurd, and contradicts the existence of the plainest natural facts. If such be legitimate or reasonable arguments, we can disprove the conception of the human body in the womb of its mother, and the implantation in that body of that sublimely mysterious *fact* we call *life*, by its dictates and canons. Life, that mysterious spark of animating energy transplanted from heaven, would be effectually demonstrated to be a non-existing thing, a falsehood, and not a fact, by this mode and principle of argument, as a rule for faith and reason. Man's reason has stood in the presence of these mysteries of conception and life for six thousand years, and it is still as ignorant of their philosophy as it is of the mystery of the "real presence" in the holy eucharist. Man knows fully as much of this supernatural mystery, revealed from heaven, as he does of that natural revelation, revealed from the womb. Faith in neither abases his reason; nor is a profound realization that both are facts, in any wise contradictory of the reason. The supernaturally revealed fact is *above* man's reason in the supernatural order. The naturally re-

vealed fact is *beyond* his reason in the natural order. Reason has no right to dispute either system of facts with faith. Her duty is to bend in respect and reverence before the altar of natural truth, and to bow in adoration and thanksgiving, subdued pride and awe, before the altar of the supernatural truth. Any man who would disturb or disbelieve the mysteries in nature, to which we allude, on the principle that they are contrary to reason, *because* beyond it, would be deemed insane. The very stones would cry out against his madness. Every one would respond to his folly by an undoubted belief in the natural fact, for the reason that no reasoning, no conclusions of logic could blot it from existence. And yet it is on such assumptions and so-called arguments as these, that all the sublime mysteries of the Church, all the consolations of her faith, so plainly revealed to her by the Apostles, are sought to be overthrown and excluded from the respect and hospitalities of reason. Her accusers ought to mend their logic, whether they made their faith or not; or else they should cease their rehearsal against the Church, which they have so long practised, about her violation of reason and common sense. Reason is never more exalted than when she stands in the presence of a fact

which she does not comprehend, and confesses her fallibility, and averts her face from all who would stimulate her incredulity *because* of her ignorance. Whatever supremacy she asserts, she founds it on a right totally different from that. Her power, she is well aware, is not derived from her incapacities. Whenever she is ignorant of the revelations to her, presented by either the natural or supernatural worlds, she joins herself to faith, and they, with a strong, indissoluble, matrimonial alliance, adopt *the fact* into their family of knowledge as a child forever, because it is revealed. And reason forms this alliance without yielding any portion of her imperial dignity or any part of her dominions. She loses no *caste* by the union. She is under every obligation to form the alliance and adopt the fact, without comprehension and without understanding, *because* she may not deny a truth, though she understand it not.

Reason cannot tell us the philosophy of the fact with which she is most intimately and inseparably associated, and which is of the essence of all her power and authority. She cannot explain how the soul is connected with the material senses of the body, so as to derive the information of external facts from these senses. This fact constitutes her own being,

and yet what account can she give of its philosophy, its rationality? She knows it is true, but is utterly powerless, in the presence of the truth, to give any rational account of the fact. The fact is revealed to her, but its mysteries ("secret things") belong to the Lord our God. And these senses, whose testimonies are deemed so infallible and unimpeachable, what have they to say of this intimate and "substantial union," and which is their life and their being? They are totally dumb, and cannot respond. The eyes do not see it. The nose does not smell it. The tongue does not taste it. The hands do not touch it. The ears do not hear it. Yet the mind and soul know that this "intimate and substantial union" exists between the soul and the senses, and between the reason and the senses, as certainly as the mind and soul know that the daily bread, eaten for daily life, is a fact and not a myth. The soul and reason move every moment among these senses, and they neither see, feel, taste, touch, or smell either. Yet in the face of all this, reason, by her matrimonial union with faith, has the fullest assurance of her being, and the verity of the soul, and the material senses. She believes it without any doubt, because of her union with faith. Is the child of the

Church, then, who believes his holy Mother, when she teaches him that when Jesus Christ said "This is my body," eat, it is bread broken for you,—is he unreasonable for believing his Mother, we ask, when she teaches him that the blessed Saviour did not utter falsehood, but spoke truth, though he cannot cognize the fact by any act of the senses, but only by an act of faith? He believes it on the veracity of God alone. Is he unreasonable for deeming that a sufficient foundation for unlimited credence? The credence reason yields to the natural facts, with their inexplicable mysteries, we have first examined, robs her not of a single sign of her magnificence and power. How does credence to the revealed fact destroy her greatness and worth, when credence to the natural one does not?

But that great fact of man, which moves among the senses with such certainty and strength, through all his existence on earth,—that fact we call life, who hath seen *it?* What is its form, its color? What is the *substance* of that fact we call our life? Who hath eaten, or heard, or handled, or tasted it? We demand of the fortunate person to give us the portrait of this fact of amazing mysteries, which reveals to us such myriads of phenomena, but keeps its own substantial ex-

istence a "secret thing." It is unapproachable by any of the senses, and yet it is united to them all, and lives in and moves among them with all its majesty and power. Reason never disputes this. She recognizes the fact as supreme before all other facts, of which faith gives her any knowledge. And the senses do not question its existence, because neither one can approach its body and cognize its substance. And why this undoubted credence, which reason and the senses so cordially and thoroughly yield to the *fact of substantial life?* Because faith, with rightful power, demands belief of the truth, in the natural order, upon the veracity of the fact alone. Just as in the supernatural order, she demands belief on the veracity of God alone. And reason, among her high attributes, reckons none higher than that which justifies the claim upon her confidence in either instance.

I conclude this section by asking the candid accuser of the Church if mysteries are not to be believed; and whether incomprehensible mysteries do not challenge the highest sanctions of faith; and whether reason does not affirm, in the purest exertions of her strength, and in her noblest attributes and loftiest excellency, in her utmost of majesty and sublime power, that the grand mysteries

of nature and religion, which faith teaches, are not incredible, but are credible; are not contrary to any of her attributes, but in union and harmony with them all.

SECTION VIII.

REASON NOT THE STANDARD OR RULE OF DIVINE FAITH.

We think it now appears that reason and faith may exert their highest powers, conjointly, in their respective spheres; and that their supremacy is never seen to better advantage than when thus uniting themselves to superinduce verity to real facts. If this does now appear, then the matter of this section might, at first sight, seem to be a work of supererogation. But as this subject, in the minds of the accusers of the Church and in infidel creeds, has fallen into almost inextricable confusion, we deem it proper to make a distinct and specific effort for its disentanglement.

Reason, then, the Church tells her children, is not a standard of divine faith. It is not such, because reason is and always has been fallible. And a fallible standard for the interpretation of an infallible rule is an ab-

surdity. Such a rule must be interpreted according to its nature, and every deduction from it must be like itself; that is, perfectly free from all error. Every application of the rule must also be like itself, and therefore perfectly free from any mixture of error. Any one can see that these propositions are necessarily true, and perfectly self-evident; for if it were allowable to deduce error and falsehood from an infallible rule, or if it were allowable to make an erroneous and false application of it, then the rule is destroyed, with all its necessities and philosophy, whatever they were.

Reason is as various as the countenances and habits of men. In the vulgar and uneducated it is of one general cast, but of innumerable varieties. In the educated it is of another general cast, but as various as the teachers and mode of teaching by which they were schooled. Every pursuit of life gives a tinge, a decided tendency to reason and thought. Every habit, of every character, colors and discolors reason. Now, divine faith is infallible, and to make fallible reason the judge of the fitness of the infallible, in the economy of divine grace and revelation, is surely not an act of reason; it is an act which outrages all reason, all correct habitudes of

thought; and it is an act, the direct tendency of which is to destroy all pure morality and faith. And this *direct tendency* must, sooner or later, develop its fearful and final results; it cannot forever cover up its poisonous influences so as to prevent its destructive effects and consequences. Hence, to erect fallible reason into a supreme pontiff, in matters of divine faith, is to unsettle all credence in divine things. If reason be the standard of divine faith,—the constitution of what is credible in divine revelation,—whose reason is created the pontiff? We must have a standard; whether it be good or bad, is another question. Whose reason, then, is the standard of divine faith? The devout Catholic must bear with the shocking nature of this question, because we are vindicating his holy Mother from aspersions, which makes it necessary for the accusations against her to be put in as glaring a light as their absurdity will allow, without blasphemy. What man's reason, then, is to be the standard of divine faith? Is it to be the reason of the untutored and illiterate peasant, or that of the gifted but perverted infidel philosopher? Is it to be the reason of the impudent and arrogant skeptic, or that of the able but dishonest and scheming politician? Is it to be the reason of the thorough

scholar and sound moral philosopher, or that of the pedant and pretentious fool? Is it to be a pagan philosopher from Greece, or a pagan statesman from Rome? Or is it the reason of a canting, pharisaical Christian, who makes a pecuniary speculation out of his hypocrisy, who is to furnish the standard by which the credibility of a divine revelation is to be tested, and by which it is to be discredited for not squaring with the measure any of these may apply to its sacred truths? No greater wrong has been done to Christianity and the souls of men, than the elevation of human reason into a supreme arbiter of divine faith. The madness of its insanity, it would seem, ought to frighten all who make a pontiff of reason to be the high priest of their idolatry. For it is rank and palpable idolatry to make human reason—confessedly fallible—the supreme authority in matters of divine faith.

Faith is the universal enlightener of reason. She extends to reason all the knowledge she acquires. If this be not so, what mean teachers, and histories, and educational institutions? These acquire their credibility and authority alone through faith. The unaccredited teacher and the discredited history teach us nothing: they are far from being instructors of reason.

There is a clear distinction, in the organization of the human mind, between a fact, or the power which is the recipient of facts, and ratiocination, or reason. This distinction is universally perceived and everywhere acknowledged by cultivated minds. And it is wholly immaterial what definition any metaphysician may give to reason, provided he does not extend it into the province of faith; for otherwise he cannot make a definition but it will exhibit this fundamental distinction in the organization of the so-called faculties of the human soul. It makes no difference what hard and extensive duty any one puts upon reason, he cannot destroy this distinction, without, to the same extent, destroying the simple and natural constitution of faith. The plain obligation of faith is to take cognizance of real facts as existing truths. But every existing fact involves within itself other truths which may or may not be deduced from it by an act of reason. And when correctly deduced, without any mistake, the inference may be aptly styled a *fact of reason*. This process, by which facts of reason are perceived, is named either induction, deduction, ratiocination, or reasoning. It is, however, a matter of pure indifference what name we give it, if we so clearly comprehend the nature

of the action as to distinguish it from every other act which may intermingle with its operations. Reason, then, as is plainly perceived, is dependent upon faith, in the spiritual order, for every act she performs. Divine faith is a fact believed on the veracity of God alone; and to this end, before a fact can be believed as of divine faith, the testimony in the case must exclude all human opinion, and all the delusions which could, by any means, circumvent the human mind to give credence to something as the Word of God which was not his Word. Faith is therefore the fundamentum or substratum of reason; she is that upon which reason erects all her works in both the natural and supernatural orders. Hence reason can never claim supremacy over faith without inverting the real order of nature in the mental constitution. She cannot obliterate any fact really perceived by faith—let her do her best. She may *correct* her facts of reason, when her fallibility has led her into error, but she can never destroy a truth, however heartily she may discredit it.

The province of reason is in the *natural order*, and her power of comprehension is very limited even in this. She comprehends the substance or ultimate condition of nothing

of which faith gives her notice as an existing fact, from the sun to the fire-fly, from the oak to the blade of grass, from the mountain to the grain of sand. She can no more tell us the final, ultimate conditions upon which a grain of sand depends for its manifest existence, than chemistry can detect the substance of light and develop the materials which give it its indescribable form. Let reason, with all the appliances of science (which is the magazine of all her facts), exert her skill to give us the substance and form of light, when the fact, with all its phenomena, illuminates her dwelling-place, and she cannot do it. She cannot give us its portrait—her daguerreotypes cannot transcribe it. It stands alone a fact, unique, indefinable, indescribable, and forever unapproachable to the subtle tests of reason, in her pride of genius and power. And this, too, is a fact in her own order. But the province of faith is in both orders: the natural and the supernatural. Her power of assurance is complete in both.

The native of the United States of America, who has never been beyond the soil of his birth, is as fully assured of the existence of London or Paris as is the Queen of Great Britain or the Emperor of France. He is as certain of the existence of Rome and St.

Petersburg as is the Pope of the one or the Emperor of Russia of the other. He is no more mistaken as to the *fact* of the pyramids than were the very Egyptians who reared them to their completion. Faith gives *knowledge* to reason in the natural order. This is now too clear for question. And in the supernatural order, in the spiritual order, she must do so, if there be any spiritual or supernatural order. St. Paul no more doubted the divinity and authority of Jesus Christ than the original Apostles; nor Titus, than he. St. Ignatius, St. Polycarp, and St. Irenæus, and those in communion with them, no more doubted it than did St. Paul or any minister of the Church who was contemporary with him. St. Basil, St. Augustine, and St. Chrysostom, three hundred years after the martyrdom of St. Paul, knew the fact as well as he did, with all the assurance that he had. And the thousand of thousands of Christian martyrs, who have since attested their knowledge, knew the same with all the assurance of Basil, Augustine, and Chrysostom. The reasoning powers, too, be it always noted, of these three fathers, were perfectly free and equal to that of any man, of any name, who has lived since they died. Faith did not abase their reason nor tend to extinguish its magnificent light.

There has been no age of the world in which they might have lived, but would have made them its boast. If the Church and her children have any chief glory outside of their faith—that sacred deposit of apostolic traditions committed to the keeping of the Church—it is that the unfettered reason of such men, in its pride of strength, bowed in humble submission and adoration to the teachings of faith which their holy Mother, the spouse of Christ, imparted to their understandings. On what assurance did these, and their predecessors,—generally, almost universally, pagans,—know the truths of revealed religion? On what assurance did the most gifted men in classic Greece and Rome, of the world, and all time, give up their paganism and become the children of the Catholic Church? On the evidence of faith—on that faith which assures us that the pyramids, Rome, London, Paris, St. Petersburg, are facts, and not delusive fabrications. And why not we, as well as they? Let some advocate of reason's supremacy over faith, some accuser of the Church, tell us why—"give us a reason." We have, in addition to what they had, the accumulated miracles of fifteen centuries to fortify our faith; and certainly, therefore, cannot have less assurance than they had.

But we have a higher authority than any yet given for the statement that reason is not the standard of divine faith: in the spiritual order, antecedent to divine revelation, at least, there was no standard of reason itself. Reason had no information and no standard by which to measure a fact of reason in the supernatural order, before divine revelation. And we affirm she has none yet, since divine faith or revelation. But the former proposition cannot be disputed, and we therefore make it the foundation proposition. Reason, then, anterior to divine faith, had no standard for herself in the supernatural order by which she could measure any fact, whether it were a simple fact or a fact of reason. She had no criterion by which to ascertain—to measure —the credibility of any fact existing in the supernatural order. What was her condition at the instant of the revelation? Did she suddenly become endowed with a new capacity to judge of the right sort of facts, and the real form of facts, which were true in the supernatural world, so as to distinguish these from fabrications in that order? One would naturally conclude that one fact revealed from that order would be as credible as another to reason, which did not tend to destroy her physical constitution, if it may be so called.

That Jesus Christ was God, is as credible to reason as any other fact which may have been revealed, and as credible as any revelation at all.

Reason had no standard of God—she had no measure of his character, antecedent to revelation. Having no standard, no criterion or measure of the character of God, and the nature of his existence, she could not assume to judge of the reasonableness or unreasonableness of his own revelation of himself. These things seem so self-evident to reason that it is amazing how any liege subject of her majesty ever fell into so marked a delusion, as to claim, on her authority, to set aside a divine revelation as a duty which he owed to her government. The attestations of faith in this matter are only grounds (reasons) for belief. Whoever denies this, necessarily denies all divine revelation from the supernatural order. There can be no standard of divine faith but a divine standard, which is the very measure and testimony the Divine Revealer established as a witness—a teacher and perpetuater of his revelation. No other can measure its nature, its necessity, and usefulness. Natural reason, human reason, if you prefer the phrase, has demonstrated her incapacity to measure a divine revelation, so

far as demonstration can be had apart from mathematical operations. Human reason cannot be a standard of divine faith, in the nature of things, for the simple reason that there is no standard of human reason itself. But grant it were a possible or even imaginable thing to obtain, in time and space, a reason that would be a standard of divine faith for all men, for all time! Grant the possibility or imagination of the fact: what then? Then comes, of course, the inquiry, who was the fortunate possessor of this rare reason, a standard of divine faith by which all revelations from the supernatural world should be measured, and to which they all should fit, or be adjudged unreasonable? Who was the man endowed with this reason? We are now proceeding upon the supposition that the reason of the man Jesus Christ is excluded from the consideration, as it is alleged his revelation to his Church does not conform to the standard we combat. Where did this man, so extraordinarily gifted, live? Among the Egyptians, the Greeks, the Romans, or the Goths? What history tells us of this prodigy of nature's creation and nurture, who was so perfectly in the image of the eternal God, as thus to be the voice of God to all men, in all ages, even unto the consummation of

the world? Are there any statues or monuments to his memory, or any *institutions* attesting his powers? Surely so remarkable a man, not the least noted characteristic of whom is that he assumes to impeach the veracity of the Son of God, and to declaim against his revelation of "The Father,"—we say, surely so remarkable a personage would have left some institution as a monument of his ministry, even if his fellows had not erected any marble columns or temples to his memory. But if they failed in this, then we ask, if he were a Greek, Egyptian, Roman, Goth, or Jew? In what age of the government in which he lived was he born? Who were its rulers or princes during his natural life? The supposition that such a man ever lived is supremely absurd—is degrading to reason.

But the accusers of the Church and advocates of the supremacy of reason over divine faith may say, Your limitation for the standard is too confined—we ought not to be limited to a single individual in our search for a standard. We have always supposed that there was a vague idea among the Church's accusers that every individual reason could rightly, for itself, impugn the faith the Church teaches her children. This fallacy is the multiplied result of all the fallacies we expose

on this point. It is plainly seen to be included in them all. But we will even waive all this, as indeed we had before done. We will take a whole nation, then, for your selection, and govern ourselves in the argument by the entire aggregate of her reason. Which, then, is the nation of men who are the arbiters—the standards of divine faith? Is it to be found in Asia, Africa, America, or Europe? If in Africa, is it a pure Negro tribe, or the more refined Egyptian? If in Europe, is it classic but pagan Greece, or the besotted Goth? If in America, which of all her aboriginal tribes is the standard of reason, and therefore the rule of divine faith? Who among the Asiatic races gives divine faith to the world in their type and order of reason? This is no less supreme folly than the other supposition of a single reason, which was to be the standard of faith for the world. But it is probable that the accuser of the Church, who advocates the supremacy of reason over the divine faith she has always taught, is so wedded to his opinion that he will not yet give it up; and he therefore shifts his position, and assumes that the aggregated reason of all men is the standard. This may seem to those who reproach the Church for her teaching to her children, as an unanswer-

able and irrefutable dogma of divine faith. But we entreat them to remember what we are doing—we are discussing with them their accusations against the Church, which allege that she teaches her children a faith that abolishes—contradicts reason, experience, and common sense. In this discussion, of course, they will not be tolerated in assuming dogmas of faith, for the salvation of the world, which plainly violate natural reason and also reveal a physical impossibility, to be overcome by the sincere inquirer, who asks what he shall do to be saved.

Let us look at this,—the dogma which tells him to consult the aggregate of human reason. There is a slight difficulty in ascertaining what is the sum of this reason. The exact *result* of African, Asian, American, and European reason, in *solido*, with all their various tribes, and races, and languages, is not a little difficult to arrive at. Reason will have some serious doubts whether she has gotten the exact truth, when she solves the problem: when she does! But this difficulty gotten over, there is one still more serious to surmount. At what age of the world will we select this aggregate of men as the standard of divine faith to be taught to all nations, even unto the consummation of the world?

This is a very serious question, upon the supposition that the accusers of the Church are serious. What fact shall induce us to select the entire race of man in any one age in preference to the entire race of man in any other age? Each generation of men that has lived will demand, with a clamor which cannot be equalled, that its lifetime be selected as the "age of reason," which is to give divine faith a standard of divine truth, to be taught to all nations, and to the end of time. And each generation will have a perfect right to "judge for itself," for the simple reason that there can, during its existence, be no judgment to oppose to its own.

This dogma approaches to, if it does not reach, the conclusion that every generation of men must be faith-makers—must make a divine faith for itself. But waive this, and let it be conceded that the reason of some one generation must furnish the rule of divine faith, to be thenceforth taught forever. In which, then, of all the generations of men, since the crucifixion of the blessed Redeemer, will the accusers of the Church, the advocates of reason's supremacy, select the aggregate of reason which is to be from thence the standard—the supreme arbiter of divine faith? Which of these generations is to furnish the

standard of reason which is to judge what is credible and what incredible as a system of divinely revealed truth and ministrations? If the devout Catholic is to abandon his faith, as against reason, it would be a very interesting fact for him to know *exactly* which among all the past generations of men, in their aggregate of reason, had the standard of this faculty, by which divine faith is to be judged credible or incredible. There is no affectionate child of the Church who would consent to be ravished from his Mother, by a teacher of reason's supremacy, unless he could have a foundation in reason for his hope of eternal happiness, as solid and as sure as that which he now has in that anchor of safety for his soul, in the deposit of faith in those apostolic traditions and observances which he knows—knows better than he knows that London, Paris, Rome, St. Petersburg, the Pyramids, are facts —the blessed Jesus Christ commissioned his Mother, the holy Apostolic Catholic Church, to teach all men, to the end of the world. Before the devout Catholic can be induced to abandon a faith so deposited and so taught, for the aggregate reason of any one named generation of men who have lived since the crucifixion, to be selected even by himself, he must be sure that the Apostles mistook

their commission and did not understand the traditions committed to their keeping. He must be satisfied, also, that though the original Apostles, and their successors for a short time, kept the faith delivered to them, and thus, so far, made true the promise of their divine Master, yet that in some after age there did arise successors to the Apostles who did corrupt and finally lose the original deposit of divine faith, and so, in their turn, did make void the promise and word of their divine Master to be with them always, to the end of the world.

We think, in the conclusion of this section, we may appeal to the candor and good sense of any accuser of the Church, however bitter his animosity against her, to say whether any child of hers would do an act of reason or one of dangerous folly, by abandoning his faith for the aggregated reason of any age of men. And we do confidently, in all sincere regard for all of the reproachers of our holy Mother's faith, make the appeal.

SECTION IX.

Human Experience not the Standard or Rule of Divine Faith.

Those who accuse the Church of infringing upon the teachings of their experience and the teachings of human experience in general, have never considered the charge which they so confidently make against her. They have never unfolded the nature of the accusation. Never, for one moment, have they analyzed it in the light of any knowledge, or of any science with which the human understanding is or may be endowed. If they had investigated their allegation just so long as it would take to raise the veil from over it, which screened it from the dust and flies, they would at once have perceived the grossness of the fallacy in their logic, and the irrationality of the principle in their reasoning. Now what is the import of the accusation? What does it mean? What is its language as a response—a reply to a divine revelation? It is simply and nakedly this, and can be nothing else: it is a declaration to God, that whatever he reveals to man from the supernatural order

must be a matter of human experience: and if the matter of the divine revelation has not been (therefore, of course) a matter of human experience, then the revelation is false, *because* it is contrary to human experience. Now can any cultivated mind, among the accusers of the holy Church, face this proposition in its unfolded reality and its native nakedness? And if he cannot, can he show any fallacy in our statement of the case. We are confident this is impossible. And we must mistake the general candor and sincerity of the accusers of the Church, if they do not abandon hereafter the accusation against her which we are now discussing. And when this shall be abandoned, we have the highest and most joyous hopes for the Church's prosperity; for we *know* that no dogma of delusion, so to speak, has ever more misled men of sense, genius, and fearless candor, than this same allegation, that the Church teaches a faith to her children which is contrary to all experience. But human experience is not the standard of divine faith, even if the accusation were true. If experience were the standard of faith, it would be a matter of infinite importance to ascertain whose experience must be the standard of divine faith. It would seem to be a conclusion of reason, at least,

that there is or has been some one personage in the world whose experience in his own age is or was superior to that of all other men. Who is he? Who was he? And it would further seem a necessary act of reason to declare that there has been some nation or tribe of people which can boast of giving birth and education to this gifted man, whose experience was or is so *infinite* as to be the voice of God in determining upon what was divinely revealed, as a fact, and to pronounce as false fabrications, and unworthy of God, all assumed revelations that were not in accordance with the limitless experience of this man of infinite power. No nation or tribe, so far as we know, claims for its own so wonderful a person. But if the claim had ever been made, we would surely have seen a contest among the nations for the paternity of this coequal with divinity. Heroic Rome would have controverted it with classic Greece; Persia with Assyria; Africa with Europe; and Asia with America; and each empire and kingdom with all of the others. And every tribe of every empire would have contested the honor with every other among its own people, and with the entire world. In fact, each family of earth would have contested it with every other family. And the

claim would, from the very nature of experience, have to be made for a contemporaneous, living man, existing in the generation of men asserting the claim. So that every generation of men would have to ascertain who among themselves was this peculiar coequal or Son of God, the experience of whom was to be a rule of divine faith forever. Forever, no! not forever. For the rule could only be for the generation living and contemporaneous with this supreme arbiter of divine faith. Mark the fact: and it is necessarily true, it cannot be otherwise. And the reason why it is necessarily true is perfectly obvious; and is because, if ever any one went behind his own generation into the past generations of men, to obtain such a personage, that moment the rule of experience would be destroyed, and the rule of faith substituted in its stead. Necessarily so. For no man, in any one age of men, knows any thing, by experience, of any past age of men. All he knows of the past he learns by the teachings of others. It is a remarkable fact that a rule of faith so plainly absurd as this dogma of experience, and one so immediately destructive of itself, should have ever been enunciated in an age of intelligence and thought. But it is still more

wonderful, it is amazing beyond measure, how any man of respectable cultivation was ever deluded by its assertion. Perhaps no one feels so keenly and vividly the wonderful delusion of this and similar dogmas of delusion, as the convert from heresy to catholicity. When his eyes are opened, and the scales of delusion fall from them, he is astounded that such deceptive dogmas should ever have obscured his mental vision for a moment. He cannot realize how it was so, though he has "experienced" the fact.

But to the subject: experience is but for a lifetime—no more. All that comes to us from the past is of faith; not of experience. Life is a series of experiences, each in succession either totally or partially despoiling its predecessor of glory and magnificence. Experience is fallible; it sometimes, nay, very often, judges that a fact which is not a fact. And as it is but for a lifetime, if it were the standard of divine faith, it would disprove all revelation antecedent to its own birth; and it must discredit all revelation subsequent to its birth, unless made directly to itself. For if it credited any before its own time, or in its own time, and not so made to itself, such credit would be an *act of faith*, and would destroy the rule of experience which

is set up as a standard of divine revelation. This is inevitable, unless those who affirm the rule, by their accusation against the Church, cast down experience when it suits them, and set up faith when *it* suits them. A rule of faith which would thus wipe out all antecedent revelation, together with all antecedent natural facts, with all contemporaneous natural and revealed facts not revealed to its presence, is rather too sweeping a measure for the use of either a professor of reason or Christianity. Neither could attend to the business of daily life one day if he were compelled to apply the rule of experience to every act he came to perform. This rule blots out all history, and its teachings as incredible assertions. All the facts in time which have preceded us are falsified by this rule. And if it be a standard of divine faith, or even of the truth of human action and modes of existence, we can prove by it that there were no human or other existences antecedent to the oldest man in the world: and so prove that this generation is its own creator. But this is not a fraction of the absurdity of this accusation against the Church. Her accusers set up a standard of divine faith that is irrational beyond all courteous attempts at characterization. For experience

is necessarily limited to human life. Having no *experience* before our own birth, we are, by this rule of divine faith, forever excluded from acquiring any experience at all; inasmuch as every *new* fact would be discredited by the rule. So that during our entire lives we would be discrediting every fact presented to us, because we had no experience of it when we were first introduced to its existence. Thus we would die exactly in the condition, as to knowledge, in which we were born, under this rule of divine faith. The first fact presented to us after our birth would be a *new* fact, and hence, under the rule, must be discredited for want of conformity to, and agreement with, our experience; and so on for each successive fact so presented, and thus we would live and die discrediting all facts, both natural and supernatural. Where then would be reason? Upon what *matter* would she operate? The rule is simply an impossible absurdity, if any thing can be at once impossible and absurd. The accusers of the Church who make their experience the standard of divine faith, have not reflected how deficient in universality, how uncatholic, in other words, experience is, both in time and space. Perhaps no one of the acts of the mind and its operations is so feeble and limited as experi-

ence. If any man will take the trouble to consider how much of his knowledge he has acquired by faith, and what portion of it he has acquired by experience, he will see the plain truth and remarkable force of the statement. Our experience consists of deductions from the very limited number of facts which we know by actual contact or observation. The knowledge we acquire through faith we obtain from teachers, from science, from history, and from revelation. The knowledge we get from reason comprises those facts which we obtain through faith and by experience. The mode our reason acquires her facts is characterized as induction, ratiocination, deduction, *reasoning*. But its name is an indifferent thing. The fact, and the nature of the operation by which the fact is developed, are what we are to be careful concerning, not the name by which we designate the fact and the act.

Now, what we are taught by our instructors from birth, what we know from history or tradition (for history is only written tradition), and what we know from science, is, beyond all comparison, more than what we know from experience and reason united; unless these very teachings of faith just referred to be called experience, which they cannot be, without the most deceptive sort of misnaming.

Faith, from the nature of things, is our great teacher. It is the foundation of all knowledge. No knowledge of truth can be had except upon real facts, believed to be true. By experience we could never know there was such a state as Egypt and such a prophet as Moses. From it we could know nothing of Greece and Rome, except what the sight of a visit might inform us. Their past glories would be a myth, if we had no teacher but experience. Adam and Eve, the Virgin Mother, Jesus Christ, the resurrection, and heaven, would all be unknown if we had no other teacher. And the man whose father and mother died before he was six months old, could not know, by experience, that he ever had any ancestors. Indeed, upon a rigid examination of the capacities of experience, it will be found that she cannot teach a man that he was born at all, or that he had any ancestors at all. Birth, it is true, is experienced in a certain sense, but not in the sense of teaching, or knowledge, or information being involved in the fact. Birth is a fact with which experience comes in contact, but which, from the conditions attending it, she has no power to teach, and no faculty of attesting, as a witness, at any future time. Our birth is a thing which is taught to us

by faith, as also by reason; but experience, though in contact with it, is incapable of teaching it. We invoke a careful consideration of this fact from any manly, sincere accuser of the Church, because she teaches her children that experience is not a rule of divine faith. Why, all the past history of the world, which is about all we know, and is, at least, the certain foundation of all, would be lost to us as fabulous and false if we are to regulate our faith by the standard of individual experience. Our experience—granting the rule would let us acquire any—is so exceedingly small in time and space, that if man had no other teacher he would always be an imbecile savage. Hence we see that faith is at once the teacher and civilizer of man. To it man owes all his boasted progress. And he who would create an inextinguishable war between faith and reason and experience—in which the first must yield to the rigid control of both or either of the last, and in which these exert perpetual supremacy over faith,—whoever would create such a war little understands the lasting injury he would inflict on man, if his designs were accomplished. But when these faculties (operations) of the human mind are justly considered, in their true relations to each other, it is

impossible that any contest can arise among them for supremacy. Each has its sphere of operations in which it is absolute; but this sphere of either can never encroach upon the other. To believe that it can, is to unmake man, and prove that God is not the Author of his faculties. When experience is set up as a standard of faith she is a manifest usurper. She usurps a power of which she is totally ignorant, and one which she has no endowment to exercise. We know that London is, and that the Pyramids are; that the Egypt of the Pharaohs, that Greece and Rome were, with as absolute certainty as we know that we live. But we have not this knowledge by experience: faith taught it to us. Reason and experience, both together, are utterly powerless to teach us these facts, and the millions of other facts taught to us by faith, which we call knowledge. And when faith was teaching us our knowledge which we have derived from her, she never for a single instant of time, for any single purpose, exerted any supremacy to which she was not fully entitled, and which was not, in a spirit of triumph, yielded to her as her own infallible right, by reason and experience. The empire of these was not invaded by the supremacy exercised by faith over the entire soul in her

teaching. Faith herself did not more rejoice in her authority and acquisitions through it, and in the supremacy she held among them, than did her younger relatives, experience and reason. As experience is the knowledge of truths we have ourselves observed, and as faith is the knowledge of truths we derive from *information* of some kind; and as the former sort of truths is very limited in number, and in time as well as in space,—it is hence manifest that experience cannot be the standard of faith. If it were, mankind never could have acquired any knowledge, as has been so certainly shown, but he would have been a perpetual, irredeemable infant. From generation to generation he would have been the same. Reason teaches us this, if she is to be trusted; and she undoubtedly is, within the sphere of her own operation and authority —when she is rightly interrogated. It is thus seen, in the clearest manner, from a variety of considerations, that experience is not the standard of any faith; *because*, if it were, man never could learn any new fact, nor any fact at all, without an abolition of the standard of credence by which he is to be taught.

At least it may be set down as in the highest degree probable that he never could learn any fact whatever, without the aid of

faith. But suppose reason, without the aid of faith, could discover *some* facts, it is very certain that, under the dogma of experience, she would discredit each one of them in succession, as fast as reason discovered them, if she is to be the standard of credibility. Because she never had observed or realized them, because they would be novelties to her, she would pronounce every discovery of truth by reason, an invention of a fact which was not a fact, for the reason of a want of conformity to her knowledge, and as against her authority, which is, her anterior realization or observance. An ornithologist, for instance, who might discover a new species of birds before unknown in that science, would be discredited by every other ornithologist, because the fact which he exhibits to the eye-sight (the new species of birds) had never been observed in all time before. In the same manner you might discredit the botanist who would discover a new plant or flower. And in the same mode the discoveries of Newton, and Fulton, and Morse, would be proved palpable untruths. Surely that criterion of faith which discredits a patent fact, simple in itself, and obvious to sense, even, where delusion is impossible, is not the standard of belief upon which man is to stake his

eternal destiny, or any other interest he esteems of any value. But there is another specification against this standard of faith: in the natural order it would strike down, with an eternal paralysis, that thing which mankind call their *progress*. How could man progress if none of the avenues to the experience of other men and former generations were left open to his own experience and faith? Progression, under such a state of things, cannot be imagined as possible. It is a contradiction in terms, and an impossibility in the nature of things, to give any credence to the possibility. At every attempted progression all the contemporaries of him who produced the *new fact*, to contribute to the progressiveness of the race, would put him down as an impostor, and his fact as an imposition, and a fraud upon experience. Every newly discovered fact, and every new revelation, therefore, if this were the standard of faith, would, from the beginning of the world to the present, have been discredited; and the world would be just where it started, at least so far as experience goes. The contemporaries of the Saviour and his Apostles would have had no trouble in legitimately discrediting his doctrines and the miracles wrought in attestation of the faith revealed

by him to them, if this had then been the standard and criterion of truth. The Athenians did probably intimate such an objection to St. Paul's teaching when they said, "He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods." But if such were the object of their speech, it has never had any influence upon the minds of any of the accusers of the Church who profess any form of Christianity. So far as it was an argument, or a standard of faith—if it were used as such—against St. Paul, it finds a response alone in the doctrine that experience is the standard of divine faith; which we have conclusively shown is untrue. But there is a better specification against this standard of divine faith, in the supernatural order, than any yet used for its refutation. This standard assumes and, if true, establishes, fundamentally and irrefutably, that there is no superior order of existence to that *natural order* in which we exist. If a just rule of faith, we say, it establishes this striking and erroneous conclusion, beyond redemption or hope of question or dispute. What now says the sincere accuser of the Church, sincere in his accusation and sincere in his profession of Christianity,—what does he say to such a standard of faith? Will he not hesitate long, and reconsider anxiously the grounds of his

faith, in the ecclesiastical relations he maintains, before he again accuses the Church for a gross wrong, because she teaches her children that human experience is not a standard of divine faith? What says our sincere man and sincere professor of Christianity to a principle which, in the natural order, disproves the simplest and purest facts of sense; and which, in the supernatural order, wipes out heaven and all the revelation and heavenly sustained traditions, and dethrones God and disinhabits his dwelling-place? He must respond. If this be so, experience is not the standard or rule of divine faith. But it *is so:* it is necessarily so, rigidly necessary, both by the laws of nature and the canons of logic. For instance, no man has realized, in the sense of experience as it is here used, the supernatural order. And the first revelation from Heaven in the supernatural order, to man in the natural order, was a new fact contrary to all human experience. By the rule of experience, therefore, it was false. It could not possibly be true, *because* it was contradictory to all experience, in the same sense, and with the exact force, and the fulness of power that any new fact is contradictory to all experience, which, by the way, is a fallacy in fact as well as in reasoning. And as the first revelation

from the supernatural order to the natural order must be discredited, under the rule in question, as contrary to experience, so must the second, and so on till the revelation of himself by Jesus Christ. And this, by the rule, must share the fate of all antecedent revelations. And so the rule disproves a supernatural order, and a God and a Father of it, and of our spirits; and disinhabits heaven. If this rule is at all distinguishable from the fallacious logic of Mr. Hume and his compeers, the accusers of the Church would do Christianity a marked service by explaining, in a clear and satisfactory manner, in what the distinction consists. And though this essay is not written to refute Mr. Hume, nor was he even in the writer's mind at its commencement, nor yet at the beginning of this section of it, still I think it may be said that his argument against divine revelation is utterly annihilated by the facts and principles here used in controverting the dogma of delusion that experience is a standard of divine faith. And it is surely, at least, made clear that the divine faith of which the Church was constituted the depository, and which she teaches and dispenses to her children, is no more contrary to experience and the canons of logic than the same is contrary to reason,

which, it has been shown, it in no manner contravenes. This section, without any such thought or design, we say, completely overthrows his dogma of infidelity, if he means by the term "experience" his individual experience, or the individual experience of other men; or if he means by it the social or communal "experience" of any people, such as the Jews, for instance, at the era of our Saviour, to whom a revelation may be made and before whom a miracle, wrought in attestation of it, may be developed. But if he means the aggregate of human "experience," the place where his insidious fallacy is believed to lurk, then it is equally ridiculous as an assertion of a fact, because individual or communal experience has been shown to be ridiculous as a principle. If Mr. Hume did mean the aggregate of human "experience," he made an assertion, of whose truth he was totally ignorant, and could not possibly know, even if it had been a fact. Mr. Hume did not, and could by no possibility, know what had been the aggregate of all human experience. For aught he knew, or could know, ten thousand miracles had been experienced among men, and even in ages when there were no letters to record them. If, then, this notable dogma of infidelity

is founded on the aggregate of human "experience," it is simply the bold assertion of a proposition, which the author did not know, and could not know, to be true; and, therefore, according to all the canons of morality and logic, a cold, naked, and unblushing falsehood. If he used the term "experience" in the individual or common sense, the whole of this section, prior to the introduction of his name in it, is a complete refutation of his infidel and insidious but now harmless fallacy.

We now appeal to the manly, honorable, and fearlessly frank accusers of the Church, to answer on their consciences, whether the Church is censurable for teaching her children that human experience is not a standard of divine faith. And we have the most perfect confidence that when such accusers adjudicate, in the forum of conscience and intelligence, upon the appeal we submit to their decision, their judgment will be that the Church does nothing wrong, but all things right, in the instruction she gives her children in matters of divine faith.

SECTION X.

Common Sense not the Standard or Rule of Divine Faith.

The subject of this section is elucidated and proved by exactly the same considerations and principles by which experience has been shown not to be the standard or rule of faith. But as common sense plays so important a part in the theology and in the faith of the accusers of the Church, it is certainly proper, if not necessary, to give its pretensions to be a rule of divine faith a separate consideration. What is common sense? Let us get a clear view of its force and meaning, when it is put forward as an exponent and interpreter and judge of the faith revealed by Jesus Christ to his Apostles, and the traditionary faith and observances which he commanded them to teach all nations, to the end of the world. It is the meaning of common sense, when thus used and applied, which we are now to seek, and not its abstract meaning, nor its rightful interpretation when used and applied in any other manner, or for any other purpose whatever. What, then, is common sense, when

put forward as the exponent, the interpreter, and the judge of the divine faith, those traditions of doctrine and observances which Jesus Christ commanded the Apostles to teach? And first let us see what it does not mean. It is obvious that it does not mean the same thing as "reason" does, nor yet the same thing as "experience" does, at least in the mind of the Church's accusers.

They mean something variant from, or as decidedly qualifying, both reason and experience; common sense, in their mind, must mean some external and generally received standard of credence which is commonly acted upon: it is a "common" thing. And it is manifest that it is human opinion of some sort. And when it concerns the question here made, it is the generally received opinion of the community, to which this sense is a "common" thing. And we may, hence, for the purposes of this discussion, define it as the generally received opinion of mankind regarding religion and morality. But let it never be forgotten—let the eyesight gaze constantly upon it, that however large or however small the community of mankind may be which makes its common sense a standard of divine faith; and how much soever it may be steeped in ignorance and debased by crime, or

however enlightened and refined, still the entire element and whole body of this common sense is human opinion. Human opinion! Yes, human opinion. It is the generally received human opinion concerning a revealed religion. How is this opinion, this common sense, formed and consolidated? It is evidently, in its whole, the full sum of all the vices and virtues of the "mankind" which enunciates it. And is therefore a composition of the sentiments, the imaginations, which conduce to opinion, the practices, the habits of thought, reflection, and action, as all these are inspired and informed by the condition of morals and culture common to the community of persons representing the common sense of what is called mankind. Hence, to preclude any idea of evasion on our part, we will again consider the dogma as that enlightenment of the common morality, the common conscience, and the common intellect, through the sentiments and imagination, through the habits of thought and reflection, through the life and practical virtues and vices; through the entire discipline of manners which tend to elevate, and also through the entire discipline of society which tends to corrupt morals and debase the perceptions of the soul for what is good and true; through all the elements and

conditions of humanity, which make up its human opinion, and which can enable this common sense rightly to accept or reject a divine revelation, or a matter claiming to be such. We regard it with reference to all these considerations. And all these we deem compassed in the definition, namely, that common sense is the generally received opinion of mankind regarding religion and morality: or, which comes nearly to the same thing, if it be not the very same, it is the generally received human opinion concerning a divinely revealed religion. The accusers of the Church must mean substantially this when they charge her with teaching a faith to her children contrary to common sense, as distinguishable from "reason" and also from "experience." But whatever idea the devotees of common sense, in matters of divine faith, have of its nature and office, when they reproach the Church for her teaching, one thing is certain, and cannot be evaded; and that is, this idea involves, folds up, within itself, a grievous folly and impious fallacy. Why? Because, when the accusation is sifted to its foundation, analyzed to its core, it develops this proposition: Whenever Almighty God assumes to reveal any matter not in accordance with my common sense, or with common sense in general,

then what he reveals is untrue. Can there be a more shocking folly than this? Can there be a more impious fallacy? Is there any mistake in the statement of the case? Each of these three questions must be answered in the negative by every well-informed, candid, and pious mind. Surely the accusers of the Church have never reflected upon the elementary nature of their charge against her, in reference to common sense. Undoubtedly they have not. For however much wrong they may have inflicted upon her and her children by their unjust reproaches, yet these children and their holy Mother cannot but be persuaded that these injuries have been heaped upon them from inconsiderate prejudice, from intemperate passion, and the injudicious violence which prejudice and passion are sure to produce. They will, rather than consider their accusers as deliberately, with a full understanding of what they do, putting forth a proposition of faith and action so revolting as this fallacy.

This view, then, of common sense, namely: the generally received opinion of mankind regarding religion and morality; or which is the generally received human opinion concerning a divinely revealed religion, is the view we shall take of it throughout this section. And this view, or any view of it, not

including either reason or experience, which can be taken by the accusers of the Church, is setting up a claim for common sense to be infallible in her judgment, and is conceding to it supreme and irrepealable authority in matters of divine faith. How human opinion gets such authority from the concession of the Church's accusers, when they deny it to the Church, and to any institution established by the Apostles, in obedience to the command of Jesus Christ, is one of those curious anomalies of error which every day amazes the children of the Church. In denying infallibility to the Church on the teachings of common sense, her accusers, by the very act, assert that it is infallible.

It is not a little remarkable that the uncatholic mind has never perceived, that whenever they lodge the final power of judging upon the truth or falsehood of a divine revelation, that *there* they necessarily establish a supreme authority; and if of any value at all, as appellate and supreme, it must be infallible authority. If it does not decide in accordance with the teachings and mind of the Holy Ghost, its decisions are worse than null: they are too terrible in their character to be defined. The uncatholic mind strangely forgets that God placed somewhere a final and infallible

arbiter in all matters pertaining to divine faith. This is surely a fact of reason, even if the Church could not show it to be a divinely revealed, simple fact.

Having now, we trust, a clear idea of what is, and also of what is not meant by common sense, and an idea which is to interpret the term throughout this section, we proceed to prove, more directly than we have hitherto done, the proposition,—That common sense is not the standard or rule of divine faith. Its right to this sacred authority is now the question. And the Church denies its authority, and teaches her children to discredit it at all times, and by all proper means. Is she criminal for so doing? Is she the destroyer of the souls of her own children, given to her by her divine spouse, because she so instructs them? The Church constantly teaches them that nothing is to be credited by them as of divine faith, save the apostolic traditions and observances which Jesus Christ commanded her to teach to all nations, for all time. This being the case, the only investigation she has to make, when she is accused of not teaching according to the common sense of mankind, is to inquire, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, whether what she teaches is contained in the revelation of

facts the Apostles were commanded to teach. Any other fact or system of facts, any opinion of mankind not contained in these, she totally ignores in her teaching. But she teaches that whatever facts and observances were comprised in the apostolic traditions,—those her children must do and observe, amidst all reproaches, and that they must lay down their lives rather than abandon them. Now which of all her accusers, on any idea whatever he may have of common sense, can affirm that *his idea* of it is what the Apostles were commanded to teach?

Divine faith aside, and as a question of mere modesty, is not the thought very gross and shocking? To get closer to the question: At what period, anterior to divine revelation, did common sense acquire its infallibility (or such infallibility, if you will) so as to be able, when the revelation was made, to judge of its fitness, in all its parts, to redeem man, and to elevate this judge itself to a knowledge infinitely superior, *in order* and in extent, to what it had before possessed? When and from whence did it derive its infallible power to discredit the apostolic teaching of the revelation of Jesus Christ, upon its simple *assertion* that such teaching was contrary to its own constitution? Was it an original endow-

ment of its nature by its Creator? or was it subsequently acquired by artificial means? Divine revelation *and* common sense are by no means equivalent terms. They are not equal to one and the same thing, and therefore not equal to each other. One of them, then, must be superior to the other. Which is superior in dignity and authority? Whoever will not believe a divine revelation, *because* contrary to his common sense, necessarily makes the latter superior to the former. There ought to be—but this is impossible—some divine authority for so divine a claim on the part of common sense. But the Divinity could not elevate this sort of sense, this peculiar character of human opinion, to a superiority over himself. He could not so endow its original constitution, that subsequently, by artificial means, it could develop or cultivate itself in such manner as to be a rule and a judge over the fitness of any revelations he should thereafter make to his creature. Such endowments would dispense with the propriety, suitableness, and necessity of all revelations from God to man. The instant man, by an original endowment, or by his subsequent acquisitions, became vested with the authority to sit in judgment upon the fitness of his Maker's revelations, and to discredit them, as against his

constitution, either original or acquired—that very instant he became the superior, and Almighty God the inferior. The judge is greater than him whom he judges. Hence the simple assertion that any act of God is untrue, *because* contrary to common sense, is little short of the coarsest blasphemy. Revelation is to be judged of by the goodness, the power, and veracity of the God revealing, and not by any sort of sense which is essentially a human opinion. If God be infinite in power, perfect in his goodness and mercy to man in his ruined condition, and eternal in his truth; and if man be of very limited and very perverted capacity in all these, with no instrument whatever to measure the economy of Heaven's King, it would be a very strange thing if God could not reveal facts contrary to man's common sense, even if it had a standard of truth to which all things, save the Word of God, were obliged to conform. It would be amazing indeed if he could not impose obligations and command duties by a revelation of his will, to which common sense and all human opinion would be obliged to yield implicit and unquestioning obedience. That common sense, or any form of human opinion, has a rightful authority to resist and contemn the expressed will of God, is a clear result of the Church-accusing dogma,

though it has not been observed by her accusers. In their anxiety to make her odious, they have never sought for the principle of their accusations. In their eagerness to justify their revolt against her authority they have overlooked the most obvious elements of shocking blasphemy which lie all over the surface of the allegations brought forward to rob her at once of her children and her faith. Why have they not perceived the patently obvious truth, that in a question of this sort the inquiry never is, what is it that common sense avouches and teaches? but it is, what is it which God has revealed and has commanded his Church to teach to all nations forever? It will be pretty evident soon, if this question were not so obvious as it is, that common sense has no standard of supernatural truth to which a revelation of God could be opposed. Yet, if there were such a standard, we deny that a divine revelation would not have authority to control, direct, and *reform it*—ay, and to change it. We insist that God could, and might, most rightfully, make a revelation to it, requiring it to *change* all its preconceived opinions, and to change every habit it had acquired, without in the least compromising his dignity, or his authority, or his reasonable ministration to his creatures.

For however proper these preconceptions and habits of common sense may have appeared to herself, they may have been altogether inconsistent with real sense as it exists in the Divine Mind. The entire revelation of himself by Jesus Christ, was to the Jews a stumbling-block. Their preconceptions and apprehensions of the personality of the blessed Saviour, and of his character as revealed by himself, and of his mission, required to be changed; and he in his lifetime had, and his Church as soon as he commissioned her had, and ever since has had, authority to demand the change. And it is to be remembered that the Jews were the keepers of the prophets and the prophetic predictions concerning the Saviour, and had the benefit of them, and the use of their own ministrations to discipline and reform the crude and passionate common sense they followed in the crucifixion of the Lord of heaven and earth. To the refined and cultivated Greeks the revelation of our Saviour was foolishness. Their common sense, rich as it was in all pagan culture, was wholly inadequate to pass any judgment upon the traditionary faith which the Apostles taught. How other pagan nations and tribes, from that day to the present, have, by their common sense, apprehended this divine revela-

tion, it were as vain as tedious to state. A divine revelation, it would seem self-evident, would have for its very purpose—at any rate, such would be its nature—the design to come in conflict with and change the common sense of men: that is, the commonly received opinion of mankind regarding religion and morality, or the generally received human opinion concerning a divine revelation.

If men's common opinions of religion, at the advent of Jesus Christ, were not contrary to God's designs, and therefore in conflict with his will, and, hence, to be changed,—what was the object of the revelation of the blessed Saviour? It is true that the Jews, as the custodians of the oracles of God, had many articles of divine faith not to be changed. But these were divinely revealed facts, and all such are excluded from the idea of common sense by the necessity and conditions of the question here discussed, as are reason and experience. This caution we deem it proper to make, to prevent the possibility of being misconceived. No divinely revealed fact enters into the consideration of the question, neither do reason and experience enter it: these have been separately considered.

Now, anterior to a revelation from God, where and what was the standard of common

sense for a divine revelation? What was its own standard for its own self concerning such a revelation? It is evident it had no such standard before the revelation. It is equally evident that, at the instant of any revelation from the supernatural order, it could have no standard, except the veracity of God alone. It is perfectly plain that this veracity is the only standard it could ever afterwards acquire. All other standards, including its own assumed infallibility, were and are fabulous, deceitful—dreadfully wicked. The revelations of God from the supernatural order to man in the natural order had to be tried and adjudged to be true, at the moment they were imparted to man, by a higher and purer standard than the common sense of the world. This is doubtless an indisputable fact. We assume that it will not be questioned. Each revelation of God to man, then, at the moment it was imparted in the natural order, had to be tried and adjudged to be true upon a higher and a purer standard than common sense. And it is further taken as granted to be an indisputable fact that each successive revelation, at the instant of its being imparted to man, was *above* his common sense; and in that view, and so far, contrary to its universal thought, sentiment, and judgment. But as

a fact in nature, and in a rigidly just sense, these successive revelations never were contrary to or contradictory of common sense at all; for it had no standard of what was true in the supernatural order for the divine revelations to contradict. The true nature and real office of these successive divine communications to man were to *inform* and enlighten his common sense by extending his knowledge. The revelation, from its office in the nature of things, and from the logical use and power of the term, opened (revealed) to man *new facts*, which is an increase or extension of knowledge, and therefore not a contradiction to any of the powers of humanity.

But in the view of being *above* common sense, in the view of not coinciding with its general ideas regarding religion and morality, viewing it as mere human opinion concerning a divinely revealed religion, it is at once conceded that there was no shade of what was claimed to be the common sense of the world —and what was its common sense, so far as it understood itself—but that the revelation of himself by Jesus Christ contradicted. And not only so, but where it was the naked common sense of the world, undisciplined in any degree, and unenlightened in any manner, by

any former divine revelation,—this naked common sense, we say, Jesus Christ demanded to be totally changed or utterly abolished. His revelation was the abolition of the world's naked common sense in reference to a divine revelation. This naked common sense, unclothed in any degree, and unenlightened in any manner by former divine revelations, was universally dethroned, and a new supernatural sense, that is, the divinely revealed faith comprised in the apostolic traditions and observances, was commanded to be enthroned in its place in the hearts of mankind, instead of the old naked sense which was thus abolished. So stood naked common sense at the first revelation from God; so it stood at each successive revelation from him, at the moment of its being imparted to man; and thus it has stood, and will forever stand, until abandoning its own false opinions, which it erroneously deems standards, it extends its knowledge by believing a divine revelation on the veracity of God alone. This is the only standard of a divinely revealed faith. None other was ever given; no other can ever be acquired. It is assumed that this statement cannot be questioned. Will the learned theologians among the accusers of the Church explain how man's naked or natural common sense

(which we will hereafter call his common sense, under the previous definitions of the term), about the beginning of the sixteenth century obtained superior endowments to what it possessed at the advent of the Son of God? No objection will be made to their response, because it may contain the matured result of their highest exertions of reason, together with all their experience. But if they cannot show a marked addition to the original endowments of common sense about that time, they surely will excuse the children of the Church for not abandoning the teaching of the Holy Apostolic Catholic Mother.

The teachings of a divine revelation against which common sense, as informed and enlightened by such teaching, had not only not revolted, but had acquiesced in for fifteen hundred years, are surely not to be lightly cast away. We do not see that the lessons of divine faith taught by this Church are to be abandoned by her children, even if her accusers had demonstrated that her dogmas of faith are contrary to common sense, in their own view of the term. And we do not perceive it, because, among other things, it is *above* (contrary to) our apprehension how a divinely revealed faith can be made to succumb to common sense, or any *human* opin-

ion, after it has been taught to the world for so many centuries. If common sense could not domineer over it and abolish it in the commencement of its teaching, by its divinely appointed ministers, we cannot understand from whence this human opinion derived its authority to destroy the faith in the sixteenth century of its teaching. And this is what we desire to see the learned theologians among the Church's accusers explain on either natural or revealed principles. Were the so-called Reformers, or any of them, as prophet or high priest, for all the rest, for all time, about the beginning of the sixteenth century, endowed by God or inspired by the Holy Ghost with the necessary capacities to pronounce the revelation made over fifteen hundred years before to the Apostles, or any part of it, as false, *because* contrary to their (modern) common sense? This, we think, is the exact and real statement of the question. At any rate, it is so just and so true to the point, that it must be answered and not evaded. And it must be responded to by simple facts and pure reason—not by mere opinion and heated declamation. For fifteen hundred years before what is called the reformation, the Catholic Church had been the recognized organ of Christ and his Apostles in teaching the

revelation of himself by the blessed Saviour to the world.

All teaching contrary to that of the holy Catholic Church, prior to that time, was universally, among acknowledged Christians of the orthodox faith, denounced as schismatical or heretical. Every heretic or schismatic that the Catholic Church had condemned and excommunicated, up to that time, the original Reformers recognized as a heretic or schismatic, with as much assurance as the very Church which had cast them off from her communion for denying or corrupting the faith of the Apostles. So far forth, then, as common sense, under the enlightenment and teaching of divine faith, had acquired any jurisdiction over the Church's teaching, it had adjudged for over fifteen hundred years, that her teaching infringed no right or prerogative over which authority had been confided to this human opinion by the constitution with which it was originally endowed by its Creator, or that it had acquired by natural development or artificial means subsequently. Common sense had not adjudged the Church a usurper of its supremacy in matters of divine faith up to that time. The Traditions of the Church—which is but another name for its universal teaching, in all time, since the days

of the Apostles,—had not been contrary to the common sense of Christians up to the institution of what is called the Reformation; that is, for over fifteen hundred years of the lifetime of Christianity.

This is conceded by the accusers of the Church, and known by Catholics. This plain matter of fact brings us up to the exact and real question on the matter immediately in point at present, and which is this: By what means and through what instrumentality did common sense, in the sixteenth century, become endowed with the *capacity*, the *right*, and the *duty* to pronounce all the anterior common sense of all former Christians as false and contrary to its own nature and constitution? We speak of common sense as before defined, and by the common sense of Christians we mean that faculty enlightened by Christian faith. This new endowment, this human opinion, common sense itself perceives is a mighty change in its nature and office: the implantation of an element as new as wonderful in its relation to divine faith into its character. Now, was this new element of jurisdiction—not only over the anterior common sense of all former Christians, but directly and mainly a matter of jurisdiction and authority in matters of divine faith,—a sudden develop-

ment of natural power, inherent in its original nature; or was it a new power given by the inspiration of the Almighty to common sense? or, in other words, was it a new revelation, which was designed by God to supplant the old faith?

The accusers of the Church are bound to tell us by which of these processes common sense acquired this new and divine power. For if it suddenly, all at once, or gradually, obtained it by the natural development of its original constitution, then the Church has a perfect right to instruct her children that the mere *process of nature* in their development cannot falsify, much less change into idolatry, a revelation of divinity. She may forever, with the security peculiar to herself, stand upon a divine revelation as superior in matters of divine faith, to nature in her best understood, fullest, and most spotless developments. Hence we may affirm, with perfect assurance, that common sense did not derive this *new* power of accusing and judging the Church by the processes of its natural development. But one other supposition is possible, which is: did it acquire this authority and jurisdiction in matters of divine faith by inspiration—a revelation from God? In the first place, reason teaches us, so far forth as she

has any standards, that God would not, after the lapse of fifteen hundred years, make a new revelation to his Church, contradictory of those original revelations by which he constituted her the teacher of all nations, even unto the consummation of the world. His commands and promises could not be thus annulled and falsified by himself.

And in the second place, no such *new* revelation is pretended to have been made to any reformer, or to any successor of any reformer. No accuser of the holy Catholic Church ever has pretended that God, by his Son, his prophets, or by his angels, ever made any *new* revelation to him, or to his sect, or to any other sect. This, of course, is conclusive that no such revelation was ever given. But if it were assumed that such new revelation had been delivered to some reformer, the holy Catholic Apostolic Church, as the guardian of the original and sacred deposit of the faith comprised in the apostolic traditions and observances which she was constituted to keep and perpetuate for her children forever, would be forced to demand who was this new revealer? Who did he claim to be? The Son of God? His angel? Or one of his prophets? And then she would demand his credentials —his supernatural powers, as exhibited in

miracles or other God-like form. And if this assumed *new* messenger could adduce no such miraculous credentials, then the Church would surely act wisely in teaching her children that such *new* doctrine was not worthy of their credence, and was, indeed, a marked insult to, and a very blunt assault upon, their common sense, as disciplined by the faith of the Apostles. That it was wholly incredible as a heaven-born and heavenly-revealed fact. That it was a delusion of mere human opinion, and utterly false as a matter of divinely revealed faith. But what is the standard of this common sense? We mean what is its standard among men? Not in the supernatural order, for there, we have seen, it is an impossibility for it to have any. Among what tribe and in what family of what tribe, is to be found *the* common sense which is *the* rule of divine faith? No more serious question can be propounded to man than this, if the Church, of which the Apostles were consecrated the teachers by the blessed Jesus himself, is to be supplanted upon the assumed rights of this sense. "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers," is the teaching of the Church to her children. And if the teachings of common sense are superior to the apostolic Church, it is of vast importance

to her children to know it; for the immortal happiness of every one of them is staked upon the truth or falsity of the teachings of their holy Mother. The common sense of the world, if there be such a sense, strictly speaking, in reference to the divine faith, is as variable as the faces, habits, and pursuits of men. The common sense of Asia is not the same, in reference to divine faith, at least, that it is in America. No two tribes in Asia, even, have the same common sense in this matter. The common sense of Europe is in very much the same condition, in relation to both Europe and America. That sort of common sense in Africa is different from all the other quarters of the globe. And each of her tribes has a common sense distinguishable from all the others, in reference to divine revelation. But to get nearer home: which of the diversified sects in religion in the United States, claiming to found their faith *alone* on the written Word, hold in their keeping the true common sense, which is the real standard by which divine faith is to be measured? Common sense is thus seen most clearly, as an every-place, every-day practical fact, to be fallible, variable, contradictory, and contestatory, on the subject of divine faith. Is a fallible, changeable, contestating thing to be set up

as a standard of divine faith—the true representative of the voice of God, which commanded his Church to teach his utterances of faith to all nations forever? The holy Catholic Apostolic Church claims that in her teachings of faith to her children—that in her utterances of her dogmas of divine doctrine—she is the true representative of the voice of God: that she utters what he commanded her to utter in teaching the world. And she *knows*, and so teaches her children and the world, that whoever or what institution soever does not utter his voice, nor even claim to utter it, in teaching divine faith, usurps a most dangerous power, and one fraught with undefinable error and with terrible peril to the souls who may trust the assumptions of the teacher. What sort of a God would he be who could utter, and establish churches to utter, all the variant and discordant and *contesting* voices which are spoken by the six hundred sects who accuse the Church of usurping the rights of common sense? He would be a fallible, changeable God, in everlasting contest, if not contradiction, with his own voice,—a God, often, of indubitable absurdities, and even crimes, and not a God of truth and holiness. The Church, in opposition to so much disorganization, announces

the faith to her children thus: "One Lord, ONE FAITH, one baptism." But the advocates of common sense as a rule of divine faith, may say, You do not discuss the rule in the exact view we attach to it; we say the rule requires only the *average* of common sense to be taken as the rule of divine faith. Very well: what is the average? How shall it be ascertained? Only by some sort of combination and comparison of the whole; the *result* of which, when a result can be had, will be the average of the entirety: and so the rule of divine faith. This (averaged) result, it will be an impossibility to obtain. If common reason can teach common sense any thing in reference to divine faith, she tells her, without any doubt, that it never could be ascertained. Imagination, even, cannot give us a probable idea, nor any idea, of what the mixture of all the common sense of all the tribes and families of men would produce as articles of divine faith, upon an averaged result from the whole. It doubtless would be the most grotesque absurdity that either a healthy or a diseased mind ever gave birth to, in the way of a mental monstrosity. The child delivered from the womb of the common sense of all minds, instead of being a son of truth, fitted to be an infallible teacher to all nations, to the con-

summation of the world, would be so very hideous a thing that its moral form and appearance would shock the most besotted pagans. No moral absurdity which the Church has condemned, from those of Simon Magus to the Mormon prophet, could equal it in horror and shamelessness.

But whatever standard of divine faith is the true one, it must have existed at the advent, or at least during the mission, of the blessed Saviour. Reason teaches common sense this, if she does not know it herself. The true standard must have existed at the time the revelation was made by which it was to be measured: otherwise there would have been a revelation and no criterion of belief—nothing by which it could be believed. This supposition, all will agree, is wholly inadmissible. Then, if common sense be *the* standard of divine faith, or a standard, it is evident that this rule of faith was the common sense of the world at the time our Saviour revealed the faith. What sort of common sense was that? Who knows, so as to reveal it to the Church for her guidance in teaching her children? It is a naked fact that there is no man or institution who or which professes, even, to be the depository of this common sense. How, then, is it to be taught? Or, rather, how is

divine faith to be taught under its regulation, and within the limits which it prescribes? It is, moreover, manifest that the same objections would obtain to a son born from the general average of this ancient common sense, as to that other birth from the womb of the general average of common sense, which we have seen would shock the very savages. The one birth would be as horrid a religious deformity as the other. But if there were, now, a person or institution claiming to be the depository of the common sense which the world had at the time of our Saviour, and the claim were granted as valid, it is a plain simple fact, as well as a fact of reason, that this sacred deposit would not be held by the common sense of mankind. It would be, instead, a TRADITIONARY DEPOSITUM. Hence faith would have to be invoked to give it credence with the world. Will the accusers of the Church take an especial note of this fact, as it exists in nature, and not in our assertion? That common sense which existed at the time our blessed Saviour revealed the faith to the Church, is now, if held by any men or institution, a traditionary depositum. So that if the Catholic Apostolic Church were to adopt this tradition, instead of the faith divinely revealed to her, she would be still teaching faith, and

not common sense. Her bishops would have to teach the world that this common sense now taught, is the same which the world had when the Saviour revealed to it his doctrines. This would be teaching faith; and if the world believed the teaching, it would be performing an act of faith, and not exercising its own common sense. The rule is destructive of itself, even if an average of the common sense, or any sort of sense, could be taught, which existed at the foundation of the Church. But a rule which destroys itself, and in the very act of distinction re-establishes the rule of faith against which the *felo de se* aimed its power, is not a rule. A rule to test divine faith, which destroys itself in the act, and by the same act introduces a new rule, variant from its own office and nature, is an absurd *expedient* of error to screen its deformity from the staid, strict gaze of an honest analysis; but not a criterion of truth. It is a mental opinion which is entirely false in fact and utterly absurd in its consequences.

We again say the accusers of the Church must mend their logic and improve upon their study of the nature of things as they really exist, and especially upon the relations of common sense to divine faith, before they arraign the holy Catholic Apostolic Church

for error in teaching as divine truths things which, in their judgment, are contrary to common sense.

But, very briefly and in conclusion, the divine faith was not revealed by the blessed Saviour to the "common" sense nor "common" any thing else of mankind; nor were the Apostles commanded to teach any thing "common." Such as common sense was, and whatever it was, the world had had enough of it: this was obvious enough, without the painful mission and wonderful death of our Saviour, to reveal and attest it. The world has had at all times an abundance of what it esteems its common sense; and the world is so confident in the graces and powers of its common sense that it never seeks or receives any guarantees for its teachings; and it especially repulses and contemns supernatural ones. But the apostolic traditions and observances, which the Church was commanded to teach, were revealed to a *select order* of men, and not to the commonalty. A select order of men were directed to teach them with authority, and not in obedience to common sense. They were to teach *the facts* revealed, and not human opinions concerning their nature. And facts, even, in the natural order, are such real and substantial things as to put at defiance

all objections of either reason, experience, or common sense. A fact, in its existence and its real effects, must exist, though reason, experience, and common sense, as they live in human opinion, all combined to discredit its forces and being.

SECTION XI.

Pecuniary Prosperity and Material Power in Individuals and Nations not a Standard or Rule of Divine Faith.

Perhaps the Church and her children never contemplate poor, fallen human nature with profounder humility and penance, than in the deep abyss where, untouched and unpenetrated by divine grace, human nature requires the faithful to contest such a proposition as this with their adversaries. If the faith of the children of the Church were not in fact continually assailed, because, as her accusers allege, it is evident her teaching tends to repress human energy in the acquisition of money and goods, and tends to hinder men in their march to material greatness and power, it would seem incredible that such a standard could be applied to her faith, to test its truth as a revelation from God.

If her faith had not been denied and she accused, *because* Catholic nations are not money-making and great in wealth and material power as Protestant nations, it would be as incredible as shocking to imagine such a test of divine faith. We read in the Beatitudes of our blessed Saviour, "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." But we read nothing of any blessing on the rich or noble. On the contrary, we learn from the lips of our divine Master that not many rich and noble were called. We hear him say, "Verily, I say unto you, that a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of God." We hear him say that the kingdom of heaven is like a certain king who made a marriage-feast for his son; and when they that were bidden went to their farms and to their merchandise, he directed his servants to go into the highways and bring to the feast whomsoever they should find. And when he saw the people cast money into the treasury, "and many that were rich cast in much, and there came a poor widow and she threw in two mites, he said, 'Verily this poor widow hath cast more in than all those which have cast into the treasury.'" We hear him say, "Therefore, take no thought, saying, what shall we eat? or what shall we drink? or

wherewithal shall we be clothed?" Hence it follows that, if his teaching be true, that any *inference* drawn against the teachings of his Church, *because* her children are poor, is false; it is a calumnious conclusion, from unwarranted assumptions, against his glorious name. Such inference is a treasonable arraignment of a fact again and again asserted by his divine Word. Such reasoning betrays an ignorance of divine faith that should speedily put itself in the way of knowledge and truth, when such conclusions are drawn with reliance upon their correctness and conscientiously. In such cases, all the good among men, and all the guardian angels of the erring, must weep with bitter tears for the folly of the accuser of the faith. And when it is made with a full knowledge that the accusation is calumnious, then is the malignity of the accusers sad indeed. Alas! what prayer shall save them from the condemnation they incur? "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do!" is a prayer that cannot be uttered for them. And, if not, the Church and her faithful children may well put on sackcloth and ashes to discover, if it may be found, the form of prayer which will bring them to cry out, "Men and brethren! what shall we do to be saved?"

How this test of divine faith came to be applied by the same men who apply those of "reason" and "experience" and "common sense," is a remarkable instance of the logical and theological fact, that when men, in matters of divine faith, once let hold of the sure apostolic traditions and observances which the blessed Jesus revealed to the holy Catholic Apostolic Church, and which he commanded her to teach forever, to follow the delusions of *their opinions*, there is no form of error which is too gross in itself, and too grossly inconsistent with other opinions to which they as firmly, as delusively cling, for them to embrace. There is no fallacy, or vagary, or absurdity, that men have not maintained and defended after denying the faith of the Church.

It would be as interesting as instructive for any of the accusers of the Church, who are, of course, as ignorant of her history as they are of her standards of faith, to glance at even a few of the wild and monstrous doctrines she has condemned throughout her lifetime, from the Ebionites to the Mormons. And what men have done who deny the faith of the Apostles which the Church teaches, they do now, and will do forever. The ever-recurring circle of errors which the Church has con-

demned is as astonishing as the errors themselves. Ask reason what logical or practical connection there is between getting gain and obtaining power over the fortunes and persons of others and divine revelation or faith, and she will respond at once that the question is an impeachment of sense and justice. Ask experience, and she will tell that few men grow rich but at the expense of honor and right. It is notoriously true, she will say, the world over, that the rigidly honest and purely religious man seldom becomes rich. Ask common sense, and, so far as she can respond, she will teach us that very few can accumulate great wealth but at the heavy expense of habitual wrong to the rights of man and the faith of God. Yet in the face of these other invoked tests, and their universal teaching, we find that the faith the Church teaches her children is accused as false, *because* the faithful are not as rich, and surrounded with so much material greatness, and earthly power, and *mechanical* splendor, as the devotees of the sects. But if reason and experience and common sense did not overthrow this pecuniary and mechanical rule of faith, undoubtedly the divine Word, whether sought in the apostolic traditions and observances or in the written Scriptures, would. And here we might dis-

miss this canon of faith as crushed in its head by the other canons which the accusers of the Church attempt to seduce into a war with her faith, but which will not make war upon her divine teaching, neither by reason of blandishments nor by reason of virulence. Waging that war, the tests of reason, experience, and common sense are aware that each must be the assassin of the other.

We choose to sift this pecuniary and mechanical test of divine faith a little more, before we cast it, as the chaff it is, to the winds. If this be a just test of divine faith, one of two things must be true: either the richest and most powerful man in the world, or the richest and most powerful nation in the world, at the ascension of our Saviour, was constituted the depository of the faith, and the lawful administrator of his sacraments. Yet, according to his Word, a very few and very poor men, of mean occupations and vulgar culture before grace, were constituted the keepers and teachers of the sacred deposit. But grant that this is a mistake, as we must do, to investigate the natural and logical character of this remarkable, this pecuniary and mechanical test of divine faith, by which the Church is despoiled of her rights and authority, in teaching the faith once com-

mitted to the saints—grant it: who, then, was this richest and most powerful man in the world, who was appointed the first supreme pontiff and vicar of Christ, *because* of his superiority in riches and power, over all his fellows? Neither reason, nor experience, nor common sense informs us. All history and all theological teaching are silent as the realms of the dead as to the existence of such a person. And we may infallibly assert that the divinely revealed faith our blessed Saviour commanded to be taught forever, to all nations, was not committed to any such personage to teach to mankind. This may be infallibly asserted on the teachings of reason, experience, and common sense. Then it must have been committed to the pagan Romans, as a nation; for they were, without doubt, at the date of our Lord's ascension, the greatest people in wealth and material power then on the globe. The individual wealth and luxury and magnificence of the Romans, and the material power of the Roman state, were then unexampled. By the pecuniary and mechanical rule of divine faith, therefore, the Roman government, or the Roman people *en masse*, was constituted the depository of the faith, and this government, or this mass of people, was commanded to teach it to the world.

Such puerilities and absurdities, alike childish, ridiculous, and revolting, are the accusers of the Church forced to adopt, if they adhere to the standards which they erect to prove her teaching false. This pecuniary and mechanical test of divine faith is too awful in its character to admit of its full exposure by probing through its rottenness to its hateful core. Indeed, when this Diana is unveiled—disrobed of its "silver shrines,"—its naked principles are so detestable, its pure, natural results so abhorrent, that few will have the hardihood and be so blind as to defend its indecency, obscenity, and blasphemy. It involves all these in a degree too shocking to unfold. So plainly and entirely is this obvious to any steady and piercing gaze, that we are far from being sure that any one who has advocated or *suggested* this rule, will not, on facing its madness and folly, shrink back from it as something he has always abhorred. If such shall be the case—if a careful, straightforward examination of its malignant deformity shall shroud the region of memory and conduct so as to be oblivious to its recognition, we, with all the children of the Church, will joyously furnish the veils which will envelop it in eternal forgetfulness, cover it up so deeply in the grave of the past that time, nor scrutiny,

nor controversy, will ever be empowered to rake it up to resurrection and another judgment.

But there are some practical examples, in the contrast of Catholic states with Protestant states, which the accusers of the Church assert as at once an evidence and illustration of the pecuniary and mechanical rule of divine faith. In Europe, England is constantly contrasted with Spain; and in America, the United States with Mexico. Why not contrast England with pagan Rome—making liberal deductions from the present state of the former in favor of the latter, on account of the advancement of the world in the knowledge of machinery and military strategy? The present power of England is owing to machines, and not to religion. But let that pass, under a dim apprehension that in process of time inanimate machines of the most exquisite workmanship and extensive usefulness may be set up as criterions of divine power, if not as a real standard of faith. There are physical causes existing in *blood and race*, and there are facts in recent history, which are sufficient to account for England's superior material power to Spain, without virtually asserting that the Almighty gave the former a divine faith which taught them the invention and use of

looms and cannon of a superior kind to those invented and used in Spain, and that therefore England has the true faith and Spain has not. England's commercial position is most commanding, why not make her physical geography a rule of divine faith, as well as her spinning-jennies and foundries? But England was invaded and totally subjugated by numerous hordes of robbers and pirates—men of peculiar energy, of blood and acquisition, even before the time of William, styled the conqueror. By these the old inhabitants were nearly exterminated. The blood of these invaders, diluted with the Norman plunderers, is the blood of the English race, and among her people "it still lives in the strength of its manhood, and full of its original spirit." The bones of a thousand tribes and the plunder of hundreds of provinces attest that this blood has lost none of its original character, however time and circumstances may have varied the forms of its peculiar development. The original inhabitants of Spain were not supplanted by foreign robbers. They struggled for eight centuries against the Moors, and finally drove them from her soil. The empire of Spain has very recently been diminished by revolutions, first in Europe and then in America. These revolutions will not be claim-

ed as standards or elements of divine faith, because the revolting colonies were of the same religion as the parent state; and therefore this loss of empire will not be attributed to the faith the Church taught to her children, and now teaches to both Spain and her once rebellious but now independent provinces. In the present century Spain has been the theatre of the most desolating war which ever afflicted a civilized state. The armies of Napoleon's marshals left her one wide field of ashes, slaked in blood. The soldiers of Wellington, sent to expel the French invaders, contributed almost as largely to the total destruction of her material wealth as did the soldiers of Napoleon. Between the two, Spanish agriculture, Spanish commerce, Spanish arts, and Spanish wealth were annihilated. All her sources of material power and progress were swept into the pools of utter destruction, which engulfed all her then capital, except the mere physical bodies of her people. This destruction of her material wealth occurred but fifty years ago. And hence it is unreasonable, is requiring too much of Spain, unless, indeed, she were miraculously assisted in the creation of money and the invention and construction of machines to multiply labor, and in the making and using engines

for war, to demand or even expect her to be the equal of Great Britain in material power. To require of any people, within fifty years, without any capital, because destroyed by hostile armies; without commerce, because of no capital to carry it on; without manufactures, because of no money to erect machinery and supply the raw material, and because of no practised skill to operate machinery. To require such a people within fifty years, to be the equal in all things to Great Britain, with her accumulations and plunders of a thousand years, is surely a hard rule of faith, and is certainly against reason, experience, and common sense. And to denounce, or to make insidious suggestions against the religion of Spain as false, because under these circumstances—these accumulated physical misfortunes, she is not England's equal in material power, is abolishing all connection between cause and effect, and all distinction between propositions which are founded in fact and those which have no existence, save in the heated prejudice a blind passion conjures up in the perverted imaginations of inconsiderate, unreflecting men. But material facts are no criterion of divine facts. There is no relation of cause and effect between a magnificent iron foundry and a divine revela-

tion: none whatever of illustration or analogy. And what consequences exist in, what facts may flow from, what moral or divine truths there may be connected with, a spinning-jenny, which are tests and criterions of the truths which were contained in the apostolic traditions and observances that the blessed Saviour revealed to the Apostles and commanded them to teach to all nations forever, is not perceived in its reason, in its experience, or in its common sense, by the Catholic mind. Because there are many cotton-factories and iron-foundries in England, it does not follow that she has been the theatre of many, or of any, divine revelations. Indeed, the accusers of the Church and the devotees of the pecuniary and mechanical test of divine faith, scout the idea that the divine mind made any revelation to his people at or just before the era of the invention of machines for spinning and weaving fabrics made of cotton. And, however much their direct assertion or covert insinuation of this test may be extended to prejudice the faith of the holy Catholic Apostolic Church, and how confidently soever her accusers may cherish this test,—still, if any one of them were put to the maintenance of a direct proposition to show the slightest connection, either natural, logical, or revealed, between a

cotton-jenny and divine revelation, he would be rather startled, and be inclined to shrink back from his criterion of faith when thus nakedly presented to his mental, moral, and religious eyesight. He would begin to evade a recognition of the principle, by ignoring a perception of its true idea and real character. So much for England and Spain.

Before we enter upon the other example, let the reader be reminded that England, by the pecuniary and mechanical rule of divine faith, is held out as a sort of standard of the true revelation of God for the whole world. And permit, kind reader, this other remark, that we, the people of the United States, are but the same people, the same blood and lineage as the English. So far as we are Anglo-Saxon, we are the very same blood. So far as we are Celtic, we are not of their lineage and race. We are not a new people; we are as old as Celts and Saxons. On this statement we proceed to the contrast between Catholic Mexico and Protestant United States. St. Augustin went as a missionary to England A. D. 595; St. Patrick about the year A. D. 440 had planted the Christian faith in Ireland, so that, whether we be Celts or whether we be Saxons, our race has been under Christian discipline and progress for twelve hundred

and seventy-four years, at least. Now, the Mexicans have been under the same discipline about three hundred years. It does not seem exactly fair nor yet a thing of reason, to require the Mexican people to advance as high in the scale of Christian civilization in three hundred years as Celts and Saxons have done in twelve hundred and seventy-four years, or else to have their faith denounced as causing whatever disparity appears between Saxons and Celts on one hand, in their moral and material aspects, as exhibited in the United States, and the Mexicans on the other. The comparison is manifestly unjust; it is plainly against reason; it contradicts all historical teaching. The Mexicans are as high now in all the elements of civilization as any pagan nation *ever was* within three hundred years after the introduction of Christianity among them. It takes long ages of training—it has taken twelve hundred and seventy-four years of training—to bring up our race to its present standard of refinement on the scale of civilization. Just so long, by the mellowing and progressive influences of the expanding elements of Christianity, has been required to cultivate and educate us to our standard of Christian cultivation and education; and just so long, consequently, have

our material refinements—our *material* refinements been ripening and progressing under the power and in the light of Christianity. Let us give the Mexicans the same chance, in time, at least, before we traduce either their blood or their religion. But another fact is affirmed, boldly, confidently affirmed, and it is commended to the reflection and unprejudiced consideration of every mind enlightened by history and enriched by thought. This fact, we presume, so confidently to advance into the presence of learning and thought, for both of which we have the highest reverence, even when perverted from their true destiny by errors of opinion, mistaken for faith,—this fact, we say, if history sustains it, makes both the blood and religion of the Mexicans superior to the English, on the theory of the pecuniary and mechanical rule of divine faith. The truth is, then, history affirms it so to be, that the Mexicans are now greatly superior in arts, science, laws, social manners,—in all the moral and *material* refinements of an enlightened civilization, to what the Anglo-Saxons were three hundred years (A. D. 895) after the introduction of Christianity among them, by St. Augustin. The fact will hold out to be truth after every proper deduction is made for the superior

means of advancement in civilization to be found in the last three centuries, to what were to be found for its advancement from A. D. 595 to A. D. 895. In all the elements of social decency, moral refinement, and political advancement, there is no comparison between the two. In gross ignorance, in brutality of manners, in incessant revolutionary turbulence, in continual insurrection, in inhuman butcheries, and horrible massacres of each other, the Anglo-Saxons, from A. D. 595 to A. D. 895, were more shameless, beyond any estimate, than have been the Mexicans during all of the three last centuries. So far, then, the pecuniary and mechanical rule of divine faith will not work out the solution demanded by its application. But there is more yet to be considered: the candid accuser of the holy Church has dispassionately, and with as little bias as it is possible for him to entertain against a people professing the Catholic faith, to ponder profoundly in a comparison between the Protestant United States and Catholic Mexico, who the Mexicans are. Who are they? The Mexicans are the descendants of the aboriginal inhabitants; they are the Indians which Catholic Spain found on the soil when she subjugated it to her power. These Indians, the Mexicans, are a sample, and a

perfectly uniform or fair one, of three hundred years of Catholic training of the aborigines. The Catholic religion has made them what they are in that time. In so far as they are distinguishable from the original inhabitants Spain found upon the soil—just so far, exactly, is their amelioration or deterioration attributable to Catholic teaching, under the circumstances in which it has been exerted; which circumstances, as every one knows, have been very far, indeed, from being favorable to the extension of pure religion and a rich harvest of fruits from the holy faith. The state has tried to awe, and has plundered, and her factions have greatly damaged the usefulness, and greatly tended to hinder altogether the teaching, of the Church, and thus to destroy the moral and civil progressiveness that underlies the religious faith of her children. But waiving this: still we say, that in so far as the Mexicans at present are different in moral, religious, and civil refinements, from the original inhabitants found on the soil, that far is their advancement justly ascribable to the teachings of the Catholic faith. These Mexicans, we now see, are our Indians—Catholic Indians. Now Protestant United States, with no intent to wound your individual pride, and with still less to insult our common

government, and with still less intent, if possible, to wound your moral and religious sensibilities, we ask you to show us the results, upon the scale of moral and civil progression, of your training of Indians for three centuries, dating back from the present. Where are your Indians—your Protestant Indians, believing your creed and practising your religion? The Mexicans are ours. They are in many cases very bad Catholics, we admit. We have no disposition to deny it, any more than to utter any other untruth. But where are your Protestant Indians, who are generally very bad Protestants? Exterminated. Bishop Ives, I believe it was, described the process of your Indian training exactly, with the accuracy of the daguerreotype, when he said: "You gave them a few Bibles and tracts, and then you exterminated them."

The accusers of the holy Catholic Church, in their inmost hearts, and in the most sacred recesses of their consciences, must freely confess that the fact stated is so. They may seek to evade the admission that Protestant faith had aught to do with the annihilation of their Indians; but they will not deny the fact that they are exterminated. We think their extermination is the consequence of Protestant teaching, and that it is the perfectly *natural*

and matured result of the pecuniary and mechanical standard of divine faith. The same result will surely follow wherever and whenever it is applied as a rule of faith to bring to immortal life any pagan or savage people. In the former part of this section we have shown this rule of divine faith contradicts the express and positive declarations of the blessed Saviour himself.

In the latter part we have shown it to be contradicted, to be utterly untrue, by the teaching of history, in the very examples and illustrations adduced in support of its truth. If these facts and considerations, having their foundation in history, reason, experience, and common sense, shall tend in any measure to excite the attention and arouse the inquiry of the accusers of the holy Church to what is truth: that system of revealed faith which she has ever taught to her children, since the blessed Saviour commanded the Apostles to teach it forever to all nations; and shall in some degree cause the clamors and denunciations, ignorantly and without investigation, made against her, to cease, then the writer will be most happy and thankful to his divine Master.

If these reflections shall tend to quell the strange delusions of Protestants as to the faith

of Catholics, and to stifle their prejudices against the holy faith of his divine Mother, then will he owe her and her divine Founder everlasting gratitude for making her least worthy son a contributor to the extension of her veneration among men. He never can, whether this occur or not, be sufficiently thankful to her for adopting him into her faith, after he had for so many years ignorantly slandered her in words and by actions, and had ten thousand times slandered her with sentiments and opinions which were profoundly false and foolishly groundless. For these crimes against her he is utterly without excuse, because her standards of faith were as open to him then as now. The profoundly learned works of her unequalled scholars, who have illumined with light all her ways, and from whom, living or dead, he could alone learn the beautiful mystery of her divine life, were just as easily attainable while he profaned her name as they are now. But he desired them not. With the universal disposition of confident ignorance and arrogant folly, he covered himself all over with the black pall of prejudice, which shuts out the truth from all minds who will not examine the faith of the holy Church by the light of her standards and living ministry. He is unworthy to be called

her son; let him be a hired but faithful and obedient servant.

We conclude this section by assuring the accusers of the Church that even for material blessings, conferred upon the world, her children are not without some large pretensions, built upon solid facts. Her children, in those much abused ages, "the middle ages," among other arts and inventions, gave to the world printing, the mariners' compass, gunpowder, artillery, spectacles, telescopes, looking-glasses, glass windows, bells, organs, the musical scale, clocks and watches. The first use of the printing-press was to give the Bible, and spread it in Latin and the vernacular among the people. One of her most devout sons, Christopher Columbus, discovered America for the world. This was some of the work which the children of the Church, did *for all time*, in the gloomy middle ages—or "the *dark* ages," as her accusers are fond of teaching their schoolboys to characterize them.

Finally, in this section, we wish to negative, in a distinct form, the question made by the pecuniary and mechanical test of divine faith we have been discussing. The question, then, never is, what looms and spinning-jennies, and iron foundries, have been invented, erected, and successfully operated by any people?

but the question always is, what are the facts which were contained in the apostolic traditions and observances which the blessed Jesus *had* revealed, before the commission, to the Apostles; and by the commission commanded them to teach to all nations, even unto the consummation of the world, in the midst of his being and presence, and with the guidance of the Holy Ghost.

SECTION XII.

The Governments or Political Constitutions of States not the Standard of Divine Faith.

The children of the holy Catholic Church never gather around their holy Mother with more earnest, with more grateful praise and thanksgiving for their spiritual maternity, than when they come to vindicate her faith from a contamination with the doctrines which are combated in the present section. Never! And never do these children bow before the altars of their Mother, and of their divine Saviour, which contain the eucharistic sacrifice, with sentiments of more profound self-abasement and mortification for poor, vain, and corrupted human nature than when they

prostrate themselves there to obtain light and grace and knowledge for the great world of heresy to abjure the *opinion* that political governments have any sort of right to interpret divine faith and to teach divine revelation to men: to obtain for this world of heresy, grace, mercy, and the knowledge of the truth, which, while it will render unto Cæsar all that is his,—will not, for riches nor poverty, for pleasure nor pain, nor for life, nor yet for death, yield to him one letter of any thing that is God's. State-craft, State-ocrasy, State-ology,—in one word, Cæsarism, as we shall see in the sequel, has always, throughout the entire lifetime of the Church, sought to influence and direct, and frequently to usurp, the teaching of the divine faith which was revealed to and deposited with the Church, and which She was commanded to teach all nations, to the end of time. In the lifetime of the blessed Saviour, the cunning and hypocritical demagogues, pertaining to both the church and state, began to teach those insidious lessons of craft and blood and robbery which have for nearly nineteen centuries characterized, in a marked manner, the clamors of that sort of men, who would, if they could, bring the political influence and power of the civil state to thwart the influence of the teaching

of divine faith by the Church. In every age and every nation, where the Church has planted the faith, revealed to her by her divine Master, and sought to water it for the perfection of his glory, she has been met by the hate and spite of Cæsar's clamorous parasites, who have always, when the wickedness of the times, and the peculiar character of the people among whom their clamors were raised, favored their designs,—excited first prejudice against the Church, then bloody persecutions against her children. State-craft has spilled nearly all the blood of the children of the Church which has watered the earth for ages. The pillage and plunder of the Church and her children have always been produced by the nefarious arts and insidious plots of state-craft—by Cæsarism.

Perhaps there are few spots on the earth where the Church has, by a careful husbandry of the accumulations of ages, amassed treasures for the poor, in her monastic and ecclesiastical establishments, but at once the cravings of Cæsar have become insatiable, and he, by one artifice and another, and by one after another, has incited his parasites and slaves to rob the Church and plunder her of the patrimony of her poor. The treasury of the poor is thus, and has been ever thus, confis-

cated for the base purposes of the basest of men, who claim an immunity and pre-emption right to defame her when Cæsar, for any subtle purpose, desires and designs to rob the poor, who were, by an especial and peculiar confidence of her blessed founder, committed to her keeping, for her to have always with her. Cæsar always clamors in exact accordance with the character of his own local power.

In the United States it is an unending theme of declamation against the Catholic Church, that the faith she teaches her children is inimical to republican liberty—to democratical institutions. The theological demagogues and the political demagogues among her accusers, utter and re-utter the charge, until their throats swell with the ceaseless act, and until many thousands of honest and well-meaning persons really come to believe that there must be *some* truth in the accusation. In fact it is altogether credible that there have been state-ocrats and parasites of state-ocrats, who have instituted this clamor to effect some insidious design of Cæsar upon the rights of the people, knowing the baseness of its falsehood, who have, nevertheless, themselves, by dint of mere repetition, come to believe their own inventions and forgeries.

It is a psychological and moral fact, that the continual repetition of what is known to be untrue, will occasionally, in some subjects, of vigorous mind even, but more vigorous imagination, delude the narrator into the opinion that what was known originally to be utterly false has finally come to be absolutely true. But waiving this as not worth establishing, in the present matter, it is certain that many tens of thousands, and millions of well-meaning persons are both deluded and frightened by these wily stratagems of Cæsar and his insidious parasites. Because it is said by those of *their sect*, they yield credence to the assertion without ever, for one short hour, studying either the life of the Church, or her teachings, or her institutions. Hence millions of honest and honorable persons have been deluded by trust and misled by confidence, to adopt the opinion that the teachings of faith by the Church to her children are inimical to liberty and to democratic governments. It is no argument against the divine right of the Church to teach, if it were a fact. If it were as true as it is untrue, it would be a most naked and most shallow fallacy to urge the fact as a reason against the Church's divine authority to teach divine revelation, and to put it forth as an evidence that her children are misled

when they practise her faith. The Church teaches what God has revealed to her—no more, no less. And if God has made a revelation to her, and has commanded her to teach it to all nations, even to the consummation of the world, which is obnoxious to liberty and democracy, as these accusers of hers understand them, it is perfectly obvious that no guilt attaches to the Church for teaching the revelation. It is, moreover, obvious, granting the accusation true, as it is false, that no man could resist this teaching without rebellion against God, to his eternal damnation, even though the revelation taught might abolish all political liberty and put an end to all democratical institutions. Whatever God reveals and commands to be taught, and taught catholically—that is, universally—to "all nations," must be taught by the Church. And must be taught without crime; and must be taught without being justly obnoxious to the censure of any politician, no matter what sort of political institutions he may advocate. Is there a higher act of shame than to justify a politician in impugning a revelation of God? Whosoever, then, denies the teaching of the Church, and arraigns her spiritual character, *because* she teaches doctrines inimical to liberty and democracy, either questions the veracity

and authority of God, or he totally misunderstands what is liberty and what is democracy. This is his dilemma: it is logical and rational: it accords with common sense, and is consistent with our experience. No ingenuity can escape from the position; no sophistry, respectable, by reason of its plausibility, can obscure its innate and practical clearness. Is the accusation against the Church true? In other words, has God revealed to mankind a religion which is destructive of liberty and democratical governments? It certainly would be strange to us, at least, if he had. And if it be true, the lifetime of the Church must be full of instances in which she exerted her spiritual power to crush liberty and to destroy democracy. Her life has been, *and is*, among —in the very midst—of all people, speaking all languages, and using all manner of political institutions. There is no language but it is the vernacular of her children—there has been none such since the day of Pentecost. There is no civil government of which her children are not citizens and subjects—there has been none such since the same day of earthly glory for the Holy Ghost. And if the accusation be a fact, it would be very easy—nothing so easy—as to specify in what ages, in what nations, and under what circumstances

of cruelty and craft, the Church has destroyed liberties and democracies. Every nation on earth must have these unlawful acts against liberty recorded in its history. So that there is not a written language on earth but can produce testimony to the fact—if it be a fact. But if these histories all omit to state, even, this accusation; if the charge can be found, neither in the lifetime of the Church nor in the lifetime of any people, for fifteen hundred years from the promulgation of the faith by her, then the clamor is patently false. Now we affirm that whenever the rights and liberties of any people have been in jeopardy, by tyranny from any quarter where the Church has had any influence, that she and her children have exerted that influence on behalf of the oppressed and down-trodden; and in favor of liberty and against all tyranny. Let an accuser of the Church contest the proposition on facts, clear historical facts, well understood in their relations to their times. He may contest it, but with no success. We affirm that proposition, then, as one that a combination of talents, learning, and honesty, will not contest, upon the well-understood facts of history. We affirm more, and further, that the noblest charter of human rights that the world has ever seen wrested from tyranny and feudal

institutions, within eighteen hundred years, was forced from a despot by the genius, courage, and learning of Catholics, under the auspices and encouragement of their spiritual mother, the Church. And what is more still, every principle of liberty in the American Constitution which is declaratory of, and which conserves the liberties of the American people, is a literal transcript in substance, and almost in terms, from that Catholic charter of human rights of which we now speak. Every American school-boy is familiar with the old renown of *Magna Charta*, wrung from King John by the barons of England. But if Protestant school-boys were informed that these "sturdy barons," who evinced so much pertinacious courage, and political genius, and profound insight into the principles on which civil liberty depends, and upon which it now lives in the United States, were, every one of them, Catholics, these same boys would stare at you in blank amazement. They have been taught to reverence *Magna Charta*, and to denounce the Church as inimical to civil liberty, in the same breath. The same school-boy exercise that applauds the one to the skies, denounces the other to the pit. Hence they cannot realize that Catholic barons were the framers of *Magna Charta*. A great wrong has been

done, is doing, to the understanding and hearts of these youths, who are the men of to-morrow. Justice has no more been done to the original and unperverted judgment and sentiment of these men of the future than it has to the holy Catholic Church. Both have been grievously wronged. But the Church is mailed in the promises and authority of God, and cannot fail; these youths, these men of the future, are clad in no such armor, and hence may be deluded forever. God grant that they may not! This is one instance in history which puts the accusers of the Church to bitter confusion, and imposes upon them the necessity of producing, at least, another instance, equally prominent and notable, equally engraven in the tracks of time and events of men by the chisel of history, in which the Church and her children invaded the rights and liberties of some one people on the face of the earth. Can her accusers do this? They cannot. They can declaim from age to age, through volumes upon volumes of general assertion and indefinite clamor. But for *a fact*—for a fact they are at a loss, a total loss.

Indeed, whoever has studied with some attention the true principles of discussion, the logical requirements of fair discussion, where facts are in question, will find, in all Prot-

estant controvertists, a singular, an amazing obliviousness to the force of facts and the necessity of facts; or rather he will find that they have made, and do always make, the most startling mistakes as to what are facts, whenever they antagonize their opinions against the faith of the Church. Whoever has studied the Protestant controvertists will find that they have made the curious mistake of regarding *opinion* and *conclusion*, no matter from whence nor how erroneously derived, *as fact.* They regard opinion as fact; and they hold the conclusions they derive from their opinions as securely and as certainly as if these were legitimate deductions from real facts. They state their opinions as facts, and deduce their conclusions from them, against the Church, as such, with as much bold confidence and flippant utterance as if they had truly fixed their premises by the sure fastenings of facts—the canons of revealed truth—which the Church teaches to her children. It is this traditionary opinion, and this traditionary mistake of opinion for fact, which causes that extraordinary neglect and disregard of the standards of the Church to which we referred in a former section. Her accusers, under the astonishing delusion that their opinions are facts, never think of examining the Church's

standards when they come to question her faith. This they deem a useless expenditure of time and a work of supererogation. For they believe, with all the assurance of a traditionary opinion, that the notions they now hold, which were delivered to them from the original Reformers, and from the wonderful accumulation of opinions their successors have gathered together since the Reformation, —they believe, we say, with all the assurance of a traditionary opinion, that all these notions are facts. They believe it. They constantly advance and state them, in serious and seemingly honest and earnest discussion. Indeed, we know that many of them are so, while we cannot know how; for it is impossible for us to fathom the curiosity of their being in earnest. How it is men can be honestly in earnest, and will, through three centuries, persistently adhere to the traditionary mistake that a traditionary opinion, or set of opinions, is a fact, is a tissue of error that the Catholic mind cannot unravel—he cannot perceive how it ever deludes the most easy to be deceived. And how this delusion imposes itself upon the accusers of the Church, against the constant appeal of her teachers and her children to the canons of her faith, to the standards of her doctrine, is a mystery of error which astonishes

the Catholic mind as greatly as does the original and persisted-in errors of Millerism, Mormonism, or Mohammedanism. Why the obstinate neglect, and as amazing as unaccountable neglect, to examine the standards of the Church, and against their plain teachings, to insist, and reinsist, iterate and reiterate, that those traditionary opinions which state for facts what the Church's standards do not so state, are nevertheless true? This is a species of obstinacy, in the adherence to a traditionary opinion, which contradicts obvious facts, that is the most puzzling of all the phenomena that any heresy has ever exhibited in the world's history. Why false opinions will not be corrected by a simple examination of facts, when the facts are everywhere attainable, and to be had for the asking, is a wonderful curiosity, beyond measure, comprehension, or characterization.

But to return directly to the subject: Those who, in the United States of America, virtually, if not in terms, make the governments or political constitutions of states the rule of divine faith, have selected the government of the United States as the true standard of a divinely revealed religion. The constitution of the United States was adopted in A. D. 1787. Those who make *it* the standard,

would do well to inform the world what *political* government was the rule of *divine* faith anterior to the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-seven! This would be an inquiry as puzzling as absurd. There is the little republic of San Marino, the oldest and steadiest to democratic principles in the world. It has existed for 1300 years. It has been for centuries under the protectorate of the Pope. It is, and always has been, a Catholic republic. But it cannot be admitted by the accusers of the Church as a standard of divine faith, because if they were to admit this little republic as the standard, their clamor against the Church would have to cease. Pushing this little Catholic republic aside, and denying to it the faith, as well as the right to be the standard of faith, we must, on the political standard, leave the world without any rule, we presume, until we can get the federal republic of the United States recognized as a supreme arbiter in matters of faith and conscience. Let us then examine her claims to be the supreme pontiff OF THE WORLD. We question her authority in this matter: we say the constitution of the United States is not the standard of divine faith; or, if it be, the world was without any standard for 1787 years, including

the age and ministry of the Apostles. This dilemma human ingenuity cannot avoid. But mark, we are not excusing the Catholic Church because she teaches a divine faith in opposition to the political constitution of our government. The Catholic Church does not teach politics. Her mission and authority is to teach alone the spiritual facts, revealed to her by the blessed Saviour,—those facts of tradition which he commanded her to teach to all nations, for all time. And we explicitly deny, again and again, that these spiritual facts which she teaches to her children, tend even to the destruction of political liberty, as enunciated in the constitution of the United States. But grant that these revealed spiritual facts which she teaches do tend to destroy this kind of civil liberty: what then? Must the Church cease to teach? Is her teaching, therefore, false? If these *political principles* are the standard of the *divine facts*, then these consequences would follow, of course; but those political principles are incapable of testing a divine fact. The revealed faith must be true, and must be taught, if God so commanded, though it tended to the overthrow of every political government on earth. If God reveal a law, and deposit its terms and divine meaning with an order of men whom he commands to

teach it to all nations, and always, to the end of the world, and this law be contrary to their existing — or after-formed — political governments, what then? Shall not the revealed Word and Law of God prevail over the political law of civil states? To assume the contrary is to maintain that the revealed Word of God may impose obligations upon the consciences and lives of men, "*provided always*" the revelation, when made, contains nothing which will be in conflict with the constitution of the United States, when it shall afterwards, in the lapse of eighteen centuries, come to be made. This is a blasphemous absurdity.

But the absurdity reaches much further than its immediate blasphemy: if the constitution of the United States be an infallible standard of divine faith, then any revelation of our blessed Saviour to the Apostles, A. D. 30 to A. D. 33, not in accordance with this constitution, though true—though the infallible Word of God, when delivered to them in the beginning, became *ipse facto* false, by the adoption of the constitution of the United States, A. D. 1787. Every Catholic child can thank God, with all the fervency of reason and faith, that his Church teaches him no diabolism so ridiculous as that is. The Church believes, and teaches her children so, that the spiritual

facts her divine Founder revealed to her are true, and that neither politicians nor political constitutions can ever falsify these facts. And she firmly believes, and teaches it as infallible truth to her children, that the revelations of God to men, through the sacerdotal order he constituted to teach divine truth, lose no part of their original veracity and obligation because the framers of political constitutions may choose, afterwards, to contradict his word. The devout Catholic, who never was other than a child of the Church, must pardon these horrible expositions of false opinions; the devout child of the Church, who has worse than lost a great portion of his life in heresy, knows full well how needful they are, and how grateful he would have been if he had met them before his life was nearly lost in nursing the error thus exposed. The doctrine that political constitutions are the standard of divine faith, would lead to the strange absurdity that we would be under obligations, under the necessity, even, to *change* divine faith every time the State altered the constitution to conflict with it: that God must then change his word of eternal truth, or else be a liar ever afterwards, is an idea so shocking, so revolting, that it is wonderful that state-craft has not had more insidious cunning than

either openly or covertly to advance it to the most corrupt men living under the most violent temptation to crime. And it is amazing that there ever were men who, under any state of circumstances, could be led into delusion by such horrible wickedness, no matter how plausibly it may have been gilded with sophistry and sin. The eternal Word of God, his everlasting truth, would, by this state-craft test, be subject to the whims, the caprices, the follies, the crimes and selfish schemes of ambitious, heartless, and polluted men. Divine faith, by the state-craft test, would have to be revealed in rigid accordance with the annual creeds of mass meetings and the platforms of political conventions; for these have become the received expositors and interpreters of political constitutions. But there are always, at least, two of these conventions —sometimes half a dozen, each of which decrees a different faith. Among these jarring and discordant decrees, how would an infallible rule of divine faith be ascertained? *By the ballot box?* That would probably suit the two religious persuasions which are the largest and pretty evenly matched, in the United States, the Methodists and the Baptists. They would have a struggle at the polls for the supremacy. And the victor would be the

arbiter of divine faith, by right of the ballot-box, and by virtue of its authority. But what would all the other varieties of sects say to a political standard of divine faith, so obtained? Let us again apologize to the devout child of the Church, who was always her child. It is with no ordinary pain and confusion that we accumulate this mass of awful absurdities. But the rule of state-craft—the political test of divine faith, itself—is of such a character that a development and exposure of its shocking fallacy cannot be properly made without stripping it naked, and exhibiting its utter, its shameless deformity. But to continue: if political constitutions are standards of divine faith, and that of the United States, became, upon its adoption, the true rule of faith, she must show some divine authority for claiming hers to be the rule. This is self-evident: otherwise other governments will not submit to her *political* teaching of *divine* faith. Wars and revolutions in States will ensue, unless some of them can show a divine charter to dictate divine faith, by means of their political constitutions, to the rest of the governments of the world. Have we, in the United States of America, any such divine charter? Can we exhibit it to the world, and demand their obedience to it because it is

divine, and is divinely revealed to the nations that our political constitution is the standard of divine faith, to which all political teaching, and all religious teaching, must conform? If so, where is this divine charter? Who keeps it? Who is its lawful interpreter—Congress or the Supreme Court? What eternal condemnation shall they suffer who shall disbelieve in its teaching, and who shall refuse to be baptized in its name? But more revolting absurdity yet abides in this state-craft test: If a political government can in any wise, in any degree how remote soever, be the standard of divine faith, then, manifestly, that political government which was the best at the time our blessed Saviour revealed his doctrines, is the true Church, and the only authorized teacher of divine faith.

It was to this political government, doubtless, that the faith was committed: this government is the guardian of the sacred deposit. Among all of the then existing governments, which was the best? The patriarchal, the tribal, the nomadic, the monarchical, the imperial, or the theocratic? This is a serious and difficult inquiry, if divine faith was committed to the best form of political government, to teach to all nations, for all time. It is inferred that the believers in state-craft,

as a test of divine faith, will insist that the faith was committed to the best form of political government to teach, because, if it be admitted that the most powerful and extensive were selected as its teacher, then imperial Rome would be the divine teacher of divine faith, and not the political government of the United States. But, at any rate, the political government of the United States did not then exist. Granted, say the accusers of the Church; but may not some federal, democratic, representative government have existed—just like it? If this be a probable thing, it is for the Church's accusers to show, by the history of the world, the class of probabilities to which they would refer it. But even that will not do: they must show the fact, and when they have shown *the fact*, still it will not do; because the actual present government of the United States is the chosen standard of divine faith by those who, in this country, clamor against the Church. It is manifest, however, that the United States can claim neither the natural nor the divine faith to give even political laws, much less religious faith, to the world. Her government is not natural, it is artificial; it is not divinely revealed, it is conventional. It is the result of the combination of human opinion, worked out on a good form of a po-

litical institution, designed to preserve and to perpetuate life, liberty, and property, for those who formed it, and for their posterity. This combination of opinion is a very different thing from each single opinion which made up the whole. Its result is very different from the matured result of each opinion forming the combination taken by itself. The government of the United States being artificial, and not natural, conventional, and not revealed, even in the judgment of the Church's most embittered and inveterate accusers, it is not well perceived how her political government could be a standard to test any natural or any revealed fact. Her government is the result of the policy of men. A result in which none of its producers procured what he deemed the true and the best government for himself and his children. On the contrary, it was à result in which, what each individual producer of it thought true and best, was qualified by a compromise with what every other varying and every other differing opinion thought best. None believed it exactly true and perfectly good as a political institution. When it was formed (made), none of its makers thought it very good, but each one probably thought it was the best which could be elicited from the universal

clashing of opinions as to what was exactly true and really good. It was not adopted as politically right, but as politically expedient, and also as an experiment. This is its character as it came from the hands of that combination of human opinion which produced it as a political result. In their judgment it was not absolutely true, but an experiment; it was not absolutely good, but an expedient. To make what is confessedly untrue and confessedly not good, as a political creed, the test of what is true in a divine revelation, is a stratagem of state-craft, and a scheme for a religion, worthy of any and of all the Cæsars who have persecuted the Church. Let the mind rest on this strange and hateful fallacy—this awful vagary—concerning the divinely revealed religion. A combination of human opinion is made that produces a certain result, which is a political expedient and a political experiment, which expedient and experiment no man, whose opinion entered into the combination producing it, believed contained either the true or the best principles of a civil government. This institution, so produced, has come, at last, in the minds and utterances of men, to be a test of the truth of that divine revelation which Jesus Christ committed to his spouse, the Church, to teach to

all nations forever. In shorter phrase, a political expedient enunciating principles not believed to be either the true or the best for a political government, is made the test of the facts of divine revelation. There it is! in its shocking plainness! Principles not believed to be politically true, by the enunciators of them, are made the tests and guardians of the holy faith revealed to the Church for her to perpetuate for all time! Amazing delusion! And it is gravely held that all the *divine facts* which the blessed Saviour revealed to the Church and commanded her to teach, which do not accord with these *political principles*, are untrue. Though the political principles were believed untrue, yet they falsify the divinely revealed facts. The facts are untrue because they do not agree with what is believed to be false. What absurdity will not Cæsar and state-craft impose upon the children of men for a divine revelation? Why is it that "the people" will not see that some wonderfully sinister purpose is at the foundation of all Cæsar's vindictive clamor against, and of all his unfounded aspersions of, the holy Catholic and Apostolic Church? It is surely *time* they would investigate the basis and hidden reasons which have kept alive this clamor and sustained these aspersions for three hundred years. If any

State government be natural, it is the patriarchal. But *it* is not, for it soon degenerates into the tribal, when, if it were natural, it would not degenerate into any other form, any more than the parental government will degenerate. The tribal degenerates into petty spoliations. These extinguish one another, and on their ruin monarchies arise. The monarchial government is not natural nor yet divine—for no man is born a king, and fitted by nature to regulate the lives, fortunes, and liberties of his fellows, nor are all other men born his subjects, and fitted alone, by nature, to do his biddings, and to submit to his judgment and will as supreme. In other words, no man is born politically supreme any more than he is born politically infallible. A theocrasy is not natural by the very terms and ideas it involves, as we learn them from the civil policy of the Jews. It is at once immediately and directly a government instituted for natural men by a supernatural mind. But one such government has existed, and its authority and offices have been abolished, and a theocrasy of *another* kind established upon its ruins, to perpetuate such of its principles as were divine and eternal. The temporary human principles that were involved in the administration of the Jewish theocracy, are all de-

stroyed. This other theocracy, which is erected upon the ruins of the old one, is purely and simply spiritual; it has no manner of political connection with, nor interest in, nor control over, any political government. Nor is it subject to the direction and control of any political government. Like light in the natural order, this spiritual government lives in all political governments, and among all men of all nations; but it is no part of any political government of any people, any more than natural light is a part of the plant which lives alone by its presence, or is part of the eye which perceives and alone exercises its function by its aid. It claims spiritual jurisdiction over no political government. As such,—as a corporation,—she *knows* no political government. The Church proclaims that her kingdom is not of this world, and she claims no political jurisdiction over any earthly civil power. But she is the spiritual teacher of *all men*, and in this character has the right—it is her duty—to reprove any government, or rather its administrators, for its evident injustices, should these exist; and to require, under the penalty of eternal condemnation, that justice take the place of injustice. She recognizes all lawful governments, and teaches her children obedience to

their civil commands. She claims and exercises spiritual jurisdiction to repress the injustices of States, through the power she has over their administrations; for she has power over their minds and consciences as her individual children, in the character of her children. This is the sphere of her spiritual power and authority, and in this she is at once supreme and exclusive; and here she is as all-potent to repress the wrongs of a state as the wrongs of an individual child. She allows neither man nor his governments any co-ordinate authority with her, within the rightful limits of her spiritual supremacy, and her exclusive authority. To do so would be her death, if it were possible for her to do wrong and to die. She teaches her children to respect and obey the laws of the political state where they reside, or happen to be. As the spiritual parent of the entire world, she acts the part of the natural parent, in the order of the family, towards his child, in reference to political governments; she teaches her children that they owe to her absolute obedience in the spiritual sphere of her teaching; and they owe to the state absolute obedience, in the political sphere, in which it regulates and protects life, liberty, and property. Just as the natural order of the *family* requires absolute

obedience from his child to his parental authority; but at the same time, if he is a good citizen or subject, he teaches the child perfect obedience to the laws of the state which regulate and protect his life, liberty, and property, and which do not usurp any spiritual authority: so the Church, the spiritual parent of all men, teaches them that, in all matters pertaining to divine faith, they owe absolute obedience to her teaching; but, at the same time, she teaches her children that they owe perfect obedience to the laws of the state which regulate and protect their lives, their liberties, and their properties, when these usurp no spiritual authority. The character and teaching of the spiritual mother to her children, concerning their duty to the state, is a perfect, a consummately perfect, analogy to the character and teaching of the natural father, in the order of the family, to his children concerning their duty to the same state. The analogy is perfect, and it is the only consummately perfect analogy known to the science of men. It is perfect because both its ratios—its resemblances—are from God. In the natural order, both the state and the parent are supreme, while both confine themselves to the legitimate exercise of the supreme power confided to their administration. There is neither jar

nor conflict between them, yet each exercises a supreme power over the very same subject. But the supremacy confided to each is administered within a different sphere of authority, and it has its foundation in a *different source* of power. The sphere of authority and the source of power is different; but the supremacy over the very same subject of government is perfect, and alike absolute in both.

These are the relations of the two natural orders, namely, the parent and the state, to each other. And precisely such are the relations of the spiritual order to the same state. That divine order, the Church, holds the same relation to that natural order, the state, exactly, as the parent of the family, and for the same reasons, namely, the sphere of authority and source of power is different. Each is supreme while it confines itself to the legitimate exercise of the supreme power confided to its administration. The divine order, the Church, is supreme as the teacher of the divine revelation of faith, which Jesus Christ committed to its keeping, as a sacred deposit, and which he commanded it "to teach *all* nations, even unto the consummation of the world;" that is, to the citizens and subjects of all political governments, and to the children of each and all their families, to the end of

time. And the natural order, the state, is supreme while alone regulating and protecting the lives, the liberties, and the properties of its citizens or subjects. The revelation of Jesus Christ could not have been "to all the world" and to "all nations" on any other idea; unless, upon a contrary supposition, it had been further understood to have been also revealed, that all manner of political governments, save one, were against the divine faith: that all, save one, were sinful institutions, and hence to be destroyed, like any other sin, by the teaching of the Church. The wrath of God is revealed against all unrighteousness. But no form of civil government, because of the character of its constitution, as tribal, imperial, or democratic, or other form, was ever denounced as a sin by any revelation of God. Neither has any revelation of his declared any form of civil government, because of the character of its constitution, as singularly and alone fitted to maintain life, liberty, and property for its citizens or subjects. It is thus entirely obvious that no conflict for supremacy can arise between the Church and the state (any more than between the parent and the state), so long as each confines itself to the legitimate exercise of the administration of the supreme power which pertains to its nature.

But the question arises: what if the state command the Church to teach for the commandments of God the doctrines of men? What if the state shall direct that she shall deny the faith committed to her keeping, by her divine Founder, and that she become the minister of a new faith, new sacraments, and a new worship, instituted by the legislative enactments of the civil power? What if some state legislature, as the parliament of England, enact, that to observe the sacraments the blessed Saviour instituted is a "CORRUPT FOLLOWING OF THE APOSTLES?"

In the XXV. of the "thirty-nine articles" of religion, "as by law established," in England (which means, we suppose, a revelation from parliament to the people), it is laid down as a rule of divine faith that "there are two sacraments ordained by Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord."

"Those five commonly called sacraments, that is to say, confirmation, penance, orders, matrimony, and extreme unction, are not to be counted sacraments of the gospel, being such as have grown partly of THE CORRUPT FOLLOWING OF THE APOSTLES, partly are states of life allowed by the Scriptures, but yet have not like nature of sacraments with baptism

and the Lord's Supper, for they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained by God." Now, we repeat, when the state enacts that the Church should teach for the commandments of God the doctrines of men; and not only so, but enacts the severest penalties of blood and forfeiture upon her ministers who shall not teach that to follow the observances of the Apostles is corrupt,—what is the Church to do when the state so enacts and commands? This is no new question to the Church; hence she is always ready with *the* answer. Her martyrs and confessors have answered it more than a thousand thousand of times, and always in the same manner; the substance of the answer being expressed in these terms, collated by St. Ambrose from the Saviour, with a brief addition of his own: "If," he says, "the emperor demands tribute, we do not refuse it; the Church lands pay tribute. *We render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's. Tribute belongs to Cæsar; we pay it:* but the Church belongs to God; certainly it cannot be given to Cæsar."*

Nero, A. D. 64, propounded to the Church the preceding interrogatory, and she obeyed

* Serm. contra Auxentium.

God rather than man; she returned *the* answer. She suffered, for her obedience to God, the penalty inflicted by the tyrannical and usurping power of the state. Her children were fed to wild beasts in the amphitheatre; they were stuck full of lighted fagots and made to walk the streets of Rome, moving, living, intelligent torches. They were burnt at the stake, sawn into two, torn asunder, ripped up with the sword, put to death by every instrument of torture that a ferocious age and a diabolical ingenuity could invent. And they prayed for their wrong-doers while they suffered their wrongs.

Such was the response of the Church to Nero. Domitian, A. D. 96, propounded the same interrogatory to the Church; and he received *the* (same) answer. Trajan, A. D. 107, again propounded it; and again the Church made *the* answer. Lucius Verus and Marcus Aurelius, A. D. 169, propounded it again; and again *the* answer was given. Severus, A. D. 202, asked the same question; and received *the* answer. Maximius, A. D. 230, asked the question; and again *the* answer was given. Decius, A. D. 252, demanded of her again; and again she gave *the* answer. Valerian, A. D. 257, made the same question; and she made *the* answer. Aurelian, A. D. 270, put the ques-

tion; and then she gave *the* answer. Diocletian, A.D. 286, made the same question; and the Church, for the tenth time, gave *the* answer. This tenth persecution lasted until Constantine, the first Christian emperor, A. D. 314, put an end to it. The one answer the Church gave the state, in her first ten bloody, remorseless, horrid persecutions, through a period of two hundred and fifty years, for obeying God rather than man, is the very answer she always gave the state when it enacted laws—made decrees—contrary to divine revelation, and commanded her to teach for the commandments of God the doctrines of men. She never had another answer to the interrogatories of Anti-Christ, when he governed the state; and she never will have another. When England reformed, then she persecuted the spouse of Christ a little longer, and with more subtlety and refinement of cruelty than did Pagan Rome. When she demanded, in her reformatory acts of religion, enacted by the parliaments of Henry and Edward, and Elizabeth, that the Church should denounce the observances of the Apostles as CORRUPT, the holy spouse of Christ returned the one response that she had made ten times to the Cæsars of Rome. The intelligent reader who desires to be well informed, from Protestant author-

ity, how bloody, how infamously refined (so to speak), and diabolically subtle, Cæsar, in England, persecuted the Church, can be satisfied by turning to the works of Edmund Burke, an immortal statesman and political philosopher. In vol. v., Little & Brown's edition of his works, in nine volumes, published in 1839, page 237, will be found some papers called "Tracts relative to the Laws against Popery in Ireland." See also Sidney Smith's Essays, title, "Catholics," p. 62; id., p 253; id., Title, "Memoirs of Capt. Rock," p. 338. These tracts consist of a naked statement of the fearful enactments (facts) contained in these persecuting laws. The candid and humane Protestant will be at once amazed, ashamed, and burning with indignation, to find that the people who have taught him, through their fabulous histories of wildest forgeries against the Church, that the Church was a persecutor, are the very people whose parliamentary records are bloated with statutes upon statutes, stuffed with robbery, forfeiture, and death against the children of the Church, which Nero's edicts, and those of his nine fearful successors, can by no means parallel. Pagan skill, in this respect, is put to the blush by the remorselessness of the apostates of the faith. One moment of reflection ought to fill

every Protestant's mind in America, in the world, with the assurance that every word he has been taught by English histories about the Church's persecution is as false as it can be shown to be insidious and interested. That one moment's reflection simply amounts to this, that for three hundred years—the period covered by these histories, with perhaps an exception of five or seven years—the government of Great Britain, in all its departments, has been in the hands of Protestants, and that no Catholic could hold any civil office within the realm, any more than he could freely enjoy the exercise of his religion. This little reflection of one moment is a complete vindication of the Church against all the aspersions of all English historians upon her character, concerning persecutions. But to come back from this digression: What answer did the Church give to England, who has so polluted human opinion with her false histories, when she reformed and forthwith and thenceforth, for three hundred years (and, to some extent, even to this day) persecuted the Church? The very same that she gave imperial Rome from Nero to Constantine. She responds to Cæsar everywhere in the same language. She would not deny the faith, but chose, as she always will, to suffer all the bloody penalties that tyrants

and usurpers could inflict upon her faithful children for obedience to God rather than to man. In no age or country has she done otherwise; in no age can she do otherwise. These facts and considerations show, conclusively, that the United States, in virtue of their political constitution, have no natural and no divine right to teach divine faith; and they also show that her constitution is not the standard of divine faith. And in concluding against the government of the United States, we have necessarily established the supreme folly of the idea that any form of political government can be a standard of divine faith. The task has not been laborious, but, from the nature of the case, it has been very disgusting. Since the institution of Christianity, how often would the Church have had to change the truth of God into a lie, if political governments were the standards of divine faith? Not a government exists now which then existed. The Roman Empire, the then political world, has long since fallen to pieces. For long ages she has been broken into contemptible fragments—has been extinguished. Many dynasties were constructed from her ruins. These have, in their turn, perished, and other, and comparatively modern, kingdoms have been established upon

their remains. Peril, change, turbulence, spoliations—every species of bloody violence and cruel craft, even detestable adultery and incest have marked the several governments, as they successively arose and exercised their terrible functions and perished. In the name of that reason—that common sense, that experience, all so much appealed to against the Church—we ask, where was the standard of divine faith, in the midst of this universal scene of corrupt life and violent death to political governments, if their constitutions were the standard?

Political parsons and demagogue politicians, who are always keen parasites of Cæsar, when inciting him to such crafty and insidious persecutions against the Church as the present age and this country can be set upon,—to such as a deluded opinion will tolerate,—do not care to look into the insanity of indecency, the blasphemy, the criminal folly and absurdity, of making political constitutions the standards of divine faith, and from thence deducing against the Church the accusation that she is hostile to civil liberty and federal democracy.*

* See "The American Citizen," pp. 84–88, by John Henry Hopkins, D.D., LL.D., Protestant Bishop of Vermont.

See Rev. R. J. Breckenridge in debate with Bishop Hughes.

If our conception of this accusation be just, and if our exposure of its character be true, we think it may be considered as another added to the dead defamations of the holy Catholic Church. It is, at least, to be hoped that reason and common sense will so far prevail among men that we will never more hear of this accusation, conceived by the contrivers of state-craft to excite Cæsar to forfeiture, robbery, and blood, and to screen him from the moral consequences of his nefarious crimes. If religion, in the form and spirit it lives among the Church's accusers, cannot silence the crafty flatterers of the emperor, then we confidently appeal to the reason and the common sense of intelligent and candid men.

In the beginning of this section we remarked that it would appear in the sequel that state-craft—that Cæsar, throughout the entire life-time of the Church—had sought to influence and direct, and frequently to usurp, the teaching of the divine faith which Christ revealed to the Church alone, and commanded her alone to teach forever. This has all along incidentally appeared. And this section has already been so much extended that we cannot, directly, elaborate the fact as we desired and expected, when we began to vindicate the

Church from Cæsar's aspersions. We must be content with merely pointing to two or three instances in the ministry of the blessed Saviour and Apostles. In Matt. xvii. 24–27, we read, "And when they were come to Capernaum, they that received tribute money came to Peter, and said, Doth not your master pay tribute? He saith, Yes. And when he was come into the house, Jesus prevented him, saying, What thinkest thou, Simon? of whom do the kings of the earth take custom or tribute? of their own children or of strangers? Peter saith unto him, of strangers. Jesus saith unto him, Then are the children free. Notwithstanding, lest we should offend them, go thou to the sea, and cast an hook, and take of the fish that first cometh up; and when thou hast opened his mouth, thou shalt find a piece of money: that take, and give unto them for me and thee." In Matt. xxii. 15–21, we read, "Then went the Pharisees and took counsel how they might entangle him in his talk. And they sent into him their disciples with the Herodians, saying, Master, we know that thou art true, and teachest the way of God in truth, neither carest thou for any man; for thou regardest not the person of men. Tell us, therefore, what thinkest thou, is it lawful to give tribute unto Cæsar or not.

But Jesus perceived their wickedness, and said, Why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites? Show me the tribute money. And they brought him a penny. And he saith unto them, Whose is this image and superscription? They say unto him, Cæsar's. Then saith he unto them, Render, therefore, unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." In the Acts, xvii. 5–8, we find as follows: "But the Jews which believed not, moved with envy, took unto them certain lewd fellows of the baser sort, and gathered a company, and set all the city on an uproar, and assaulted the house of Jason, and sought to bring them (SS. Paul and Silas) out to the people. And when they found them not, they drew Jason and certain brethren unto the rulers of the city, crying, These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also; whom Jason hath received: *and these all do contrary to the decrees of Cæsar*, saying that there is another king, one Jesus. And they troubled the people and the rulers of the city, when they heard these things." The minions of Cæsar here exhibit three characteristics, which have ever since, in every successive mob or insurrection they have incited against the Church, marked them deeply and indelibly; every persecution of the Church

has engraven upon it these same three diabolical foot-prints of Satan—the ineffaceable traceries of hell. These three engravings of Satan, characterizing—branding all Cæsar's minions, are, first, an accusation against the Church that her children are mobocrats and insurrectionists: "These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also." Secondly, on their own malignant falsehood, they excite, in the name of Cæsar, a mob and insurrection, *of their own*, to persecute the Church of Christ, instituted by his Apostles, in obedience to his command. Thirdly, this greatly troubles honest men, who have no sinister purposes to accomplish by falsehoods and mobs or insurrections: "And they troubled the people and the rulers of the city, when they heard these things." These three brands are indelibly burned, deeply, into the flesh of every persecutor of the Church, who appeals to Cæsar for the rectitude of his intentions, from the Pharisees who tempted Christ concerning the lawfulness of tribute, down to the last motion in the British parliament by the Hon. Mr. Spooner, and the last act of persecution in a Boston district school, in the State of Massachusetts. And they will characterize the last act of persecution by Cæsar's slaves that shall intervene between

the present writing and the day of the final consummation of all things.

Finally, we negative the affirmative of the question made by state-craft; we conclude with an issue to Cæsar. We deny, then, that the question ever is, what does the state—what does Cæsar teach and tolerate? And we maintain, on the contrary, that the question always is, what were the facts of divine faith contained in the traditionary revelations which the blessed Jesus had, before his ascension, committed to, deposited with, the Apostolic Church, and which he, at his ascension, commanded it to teach all nations, to the end of the world. This is always the question; that other is an untruth in its very essence and nature, and cannot be sanely propounded in reference to a divinely revealed religion. It is false in all its applications as a test of the sacred deposit of divine faith, which the Church has always taught, and cannot be tolerated as a standard of this faith by rational and devout inquirers after the truth which pertains to eternal life.

SECTION XIII.

THE SENSES OF TASTING, SMELLING, SEEING, AND TOUCHING NOT THE STANDARDS OF DIVINE FAITH; NOR ESSENTIAL OR MATERIAL ELEMENTS ENTERING INTO THE RULE, AND CONSTITUTING EITHER ITS SUBSTANCE OR ITS VALIDITY, AS A CRITERION OF DIVINE TRUTH IN REVELATION. HEARING IS THE ORGAN OF FAITH.

THE senses of tasting, smelling, seeing, and touching are not standards of divine faith: nor are they either essential or material elements of the rule, entering into it, and constituting its substance or validity, as a criterion of divine truth in revelation; but hearing is the organ of faith.

That the accusers of the holy Church should ever have made the senses, which we negative as such, a rule of divine faith, in any manner or in any degree, is but another revival of the practical and philosophical fact that error, when once instituted, as a principle of faith and action, will work out its own tendencies, how terrible soever these may be, and how astonishingly foolish soever they may be: That error, however slight, and how little soever variant from truth and justice, in its original apostasy from these, contains within itself, as a

part of its real nature and absolute essence, crime and folly, which as they gradually unfold themselves from their native tendency, develop pernicious weakness, absurd wickedness, and horrid crime.

That the accusers of the Church should have made the four (negatived) senses a Rule of divine faith; should have appealed to them as, in any manner, interpreters of divine truth, illustrates the trite truth, that once begin to believe and do wrong, however small the fault, and there is no foreseeing to what ultimate and terrible wickedness it will lead. What is there, in these four senses that gives them their power to delude the human mind with the notion that they are criterions of truth in divine revelation? Nothing,—manifestly nothing. Their nature and office, seemingly, have not any tendency either to beget, develop, or perpetuate such a delusion. The truth is, this amazing deception does not exist in them; but it exists in the original error of apostasy from the Faith; in its birth, or in some of the successive states of its remarkable developments. Put these four senses in affirmative, predicative juxtaposition with divine faith or revelation: "I taste a divine truth or revelation;" "I smell a divine truth or revelation;" "I see a divine truth or revela-

tion;" "I touch a divine truth or revelation." Is there not something shockingly unholy and gross in the immorality of such averments?

It is said in the written word, "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." This is a revealed fact, in accordance first, with the necessary relation of things, so far as human powers can perceive them. God speaketh: His word is heard; and when heard it is believed. This is Faith, without which it is impossible to please God. Next, it is in accordance with our limited experience, and all our faculties which cognize any of our knowledge. We derive, comparatively, all our knowledge through hearing. Divine revelation, certainly, was not made to the four senses which we have negatived as rules of divine faith. Taste, smell, touch, and sight were not the recipients of divine revelation; and from their nature, and the nature of revelation, it would seem an impossible thing, naturally speaking, that they could be. All the fitness of natural things, at least, is destroyed, when these senses are made the recipients of divine revelation. It was not adapted to any of these four senses. It is no part of the Christian's duty to ask why?

Their incapacity to recognize words and perpetuate spoken truth, is a material and

sufficient one. Every one who has taken pains to study the sources of his knowledge, with any care, has plainly perceived these senses have very little—(none comparatively, if absolutely any)—relation to the intellectual, moral, and religious powers in man. Hence it is said that Faith cometh by hearing. This seems so clearly and profound a necessity, in the nature of things, naturally and spiritually, that if it had not been virtually denied, we could not imagine how it could ever be questioned. We believe in the miraculous conception, life, death, and resurrection of our Saviour,—not because taste, smell, touch, and sight, attest their truth or give us any knowledge of them as facts. And so it is for every spiritual fact revealed to man, concerning his relations to the supernatural world, and concerning his eternal destiny. And so it is for every natural and contemporaneous fact, which we know; but which we have not tasted, touched, seen, or smelled,—and cannot. We believe in the future life, in heaven (not from any information given us by these four senses, nor from any attestation or corroborative sanctity they give to the fact), after it has been made known to us, through the *organ* of Divine Faith—which is hearing. Faith teaches us all we know of our future destiny, and faith cometh by hearing.

The Divine Word was revealed to hearing from necessity, as we have said. Man had no other sense to which the Revelation could be addressed without a total change of his physical constitution. Words cannot be smelled, tasted, touched, or seen. Hence, we *hear* the word of God. It may be,—indeed it is so without doubt—that hearing is the most dignified and spiritual of all our senses; and therefore the relation between it and divine faith. Hearing is, beyond question, the least *sensual*, the farthest removed from *animalism*, of all our senses. The excessive indulgence of the other senses has an immediate tendency to imbrute man. But it is not perceived that there is any such immediate tendency to brutalize him by any use we can make of our hearing. If we distinguish an excessive use from an *improper* use, it is not easy to define or imagine what, in strictness, would be an excessive indulgence of the sense of hearing. But waiving this distinction, and yielding what we have no desire to doubt, and will not allow to be questioned; namely, that when the sense of hearing is indulged in presenting to the mind impure images, and bad and unholy thoughts, through the instrumentality of words, that then it is in excess, and that this excess tends to corrupt man,—still its brutali-

zing tendencies are not so positive and immediate as is the excessive indulgence of the other senses.

It being more noble, of course it cannot be so readily degraded; being more spiritual, it cannot so easily be brutalized. The other senses are so peculiarly animal—so utterly destitute of all spirituality, so wanting in kindred with the higher parts of our being; namely, the intellectual, the moral, and the religious, that it may be well questioned whether they are, at all, channels of communication, for any eternal purpose, leading to these departments. So far as human capacities can judge, that judgment is against the belief that they are. Hearing is at all events, and without any question, supreme in spiritual aptitudes and power among the senses. Its realization of spoken truth and its recognition of its sources, are exertions of rightful authority from which there is no appeal but to the *reality* of the voice of God. When, on such an appeal, fraud and delusion and mistake are excluded from the elements of the case in hand; and the sense of hearing, after eliminating these, recognizes really and truly the voice of God; then her teaching is supreme, her realization is infallible;—it is God's word. Hearing thus teaches us the divine word with infal-

lible certainty, even against the solemn protest of all the other senses; provided they could be so absurdly pretentious as to ignore their own nature and fundamental organization and practical constitution, as to assume either to teach or interpret the words of a divine revelation; or any other words teaching man any important relations which he sustains to the natural or supernatural worlds. "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God:" So that whatever God by his word, reveals to man is credible without regard to the recognition and realization,—in a word to the *teaching* of the other senses. These (other) senses have no power to teach words. And if they had, God never gave them authority to teach his word: his divine revelation of traditionary faith, which he commanded the Church to teach to "all nations, even unto the consummation of the world." These words at least, were not seen, nor smelled, nor touched, nor tasted. So that faith in God must be through the *organ* of faith, and must not be on the testimony of any, nor of all, the other four senses. These four senses, must not come and attest to the soul that God has not spoken, when he has uttered his voice. And, moreover, these senses must not come and assume to *correct*

the word of God, as realized and recognized, by hearing when there is no dispute about the fact of a revelation; but only a question as to what the revelation means; and this dispute gotten up by these four senses themselves. They cannot interpret the meaning of words for hearing. They are not organized for the recognition of words. Their nature is wholly unfit for, and entirely unendowed with any power to realize or interpret any language,—let alone the language of divine revelation and faith. If taste, touch, smell, or sight may assume supremacy to pronounce against the word of God, and against the authority of his Apostolic Church in teaching it, they are certainly usurping an authority not given to them in the natural order; and more surely still, such power as they have no right to exercise in the spiritual order. They were not made to perform or to interpret the office and functions of the ear in the natural order. From whence do they derive such authority in the spiritual and the supernatural? And this against the divine declaration that "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God."

It is thus manifest that neither in the natural nor in the supernatural orders have those senses any right to reveal or to interpret lan-

guage. They have no authority to instruct us whether or not there be any language, much less to decide upon its consistency with reason, and to determine its coincidence with common sense, or to fix its correspondence with truth by any other criterion. For instance, God has either revealed to the holy Mother Church the "Real Presence" or he has not. This sacrifice, daily offered on all her altars, where there is a priest to make the holy offering *was*, one of the traditionary facts which the blessed Saviour commanded this Church to teach and observe forever; or it was not one of those facts which he had revealed to her before, and commissioned her to teach at his ascension. And if this institution of the eucharistic sacrifice was not revealed to his Church, by the Saviour, among those traditionary facts of faith he commanded her to teach; then this "Mystery of faith" is untrue, a fabrication, a falsehood. We say God has either revealed the faith and mystery of the "Real Presence" in the daily eucharistic sacrifice or he has not. But whether he has or not, depends upon his word: and this can neither be seen, smelled, touched, nor tasted. This fact depends upon the word of God; and not upon any lessons these four senses teach us. The WORDS OF THE INSTITU-

TION, by which the faith and mystery were revealed to the Church, are:—"And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; THIS IS MY BODY. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Matt. xxvi. 26–28. St. Paul, in 1 Cor. xi. 23–27, states the words of INSTITUTION as follows: "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat; THIS IS MY BODY, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me: for as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come: wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the BODY AND BLOOD of the Lord." Verse twenty-ninth reads: "For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and

drinketh damnation to himself, NOT DISCERNING THE LORD'S BODY." In the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel, the blessed Saviour fully prefigured and identified this institution and its elements. Among other most unmistakable things, he (48–51) says: "I am *that* bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead. *This* is the bread which cometh down from heaven that a man may eat thereof and not die. I AM the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of THIS BREAD, he shall live forever; AND THE BREAD THAT I WILL GIVE IS MY FLESH, which I will give for the life of the world." The Jews murmured at this, and he reiterated it with renewed positiveness and distinctness, so that thereafter there should be no mistake about the *words*, nor yet about their meaning. As soon as they murmured their objection to his sacred word, in ver. 53–58, he repeated: "Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood,

dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is the bread which came down from heaven; not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead; he that eateth of this bread shall live forever."

Will the accusers of the holy Mother Church now explain how smell and touch and sight and taste get any authority from reason and common sense and experience to contradict the word of God just quoted, which is so clear in its terms, and so explicit in its circumstances, and so manifest by the occasions of its utterance? Not to interpret it as the Church which heard it does, and to interpret it as her accusers do, who did not hear it, is to contradict itself. Now, this is the Word of God from which faith cometh. To contradict is, not to believe. If faith believes the Word of God, the faith and mystery of the "Real Presence" was revealed to the Church. If the sense of hearing is allowed to be the authority for what was revealed, when God is admitted, by the Church's accusers, to have spoken; the Church cannot be mistaken in taking him at his word. Is it not blasphemous to assert the contrary, even if hearing were not the only and the infallible sense to

which the revelation was made? Yet men do contradict the Church in her teaching that the very Word of God is true, which he has thus distinctly spoken in his commemorative institution. Men professing to be Christians do it. Yea, more, there are men professing to be Christians who contradict the Church when she teaches these *very words of God to be true*, who yet claim that their faith is built alone upon the (written) Scriptures. The accusers of the Church, who will not allow that any thing *more* was revealed by the blessed Saviour to her than what, in the *opinion* of their own sect, is to be found in the Gospels and Epistles, denounce her for teaching her children that the Word of God, in the institution, is true, *as heard*. The accusers of the Spouse of Christ, who deny that the Lord Jesus revealed to the holy Mother Church (when he commissioned her to teach to "all nations" "all things whatsoever he had commanded," to the end of the world) any thing *more than* their construction of the written Word says is reasonable, is consonant to their common sense, is consistent with their experience,—these same accusers charge this holy Mother, who heard the words of revelation she was commanded to perpetuate forever, with folly and idolatry, *because* she believes the

words she *heard* spoken to her, to be a fact, to be and to mean what was said to her. She is told she violates reason, usurps common sense, and contradicts all experience, when she instructs her children that the Word spoken to her and given to her keeping to teach forever, is true, and cannot be contradicted without crime. These tests of a divine faith we have before considered. Now, as before written, God, by his *Word*, revealed the faith and mystery the Church teaches her children in the eucharistic sacrifice, or he did not. As the Word of God is the test (and none can be so sure), we may, by simply *hearing* the Word, erect our faith on infallible and divine authority. We cannot be mistaken: THIS IS MY BODY; THIS IS MY BLOOD. The Church understands by this Word, and teaches her children so, exactly what was said when the terms of it were spoken in her hearing. She understands the Word to be what was said to her—what she heard when it was uttered first and alone, *because* the Word of God is infallible against all the human senses, and all the testimony of the human mind, if it were possible for all the testimony of the human mind, when healthily exercised, to contradict the Word of God. When God is so contradicted, the mind is morally and pro-

foundly diseased which makes the contradiction. For let it never be forgotten that the holy Mother Church heard (because they were spoken to her) the words of institution which she was commanded to teach and observe; THAT SHE UNDERSTOOD THEM, that she cannot mistake them, that it is a fact of reason, secured by a distinct promise of God, that she could never, and can never forget them, nor cease to practise their true meaning. Let this never be forgotten. Let this never be forgotten. Let this never be forgotten. If you teach nothing else to them, teach this diligently to your children. And because she heard these words when they were spoken to her; and because she understood them; and because the Holy Ghost was sent to her, in fulfilment of a divine promise, to keep her in remembrance of them, so that she could always state them just as they were originally uttered to her and in her hearing without any mistake; and because her practice and observance of it was in exact accordance with the divine intention and instruction,—she therefore believes the terms in which the eucharistic sacrifice was revealed and commanded to be taught and observed to be true, to be a reality; and she does not believe they are tropes in a rhetorical exercise. The institution of this sacrifice was not an occasion

for an ostentatious exhibition of rhetorical accomplishments. The Church never thought so; and she teaches her children that her divine Master meant what he said, and was not, for a mere display of oratory, exciting discontent among the Jews: that he was not uttering "a hard saying" in hyperboles merely to embellish a statement which was untrue in itself. She teaches her children that her divine Master did not gild and polish with rhetorical varnish statements of instruction, to organize this institution, which statements were false and the instruction deceptive. She believes, and teaches her children to believe his Word on the veracity of God alone; for she knows there was neither fraud, nor delusion, nor mistake, nor yet rhetorical deception, in the matter of this revelation of this sacred sacrifice. She knows it was the Word of God in reality which she heard. Indeed, no one of her accusers has ever disputed that there was in fact a revelation to the holy Mother Church of this institution, by the blessed Saviour. But her modern ones, at least, impeach her understanding of what was spoken to her. They modestly affirm that she did not comprehend her divine Spouse, and that she mistook his meaning and intention in the utterances of his divine command.

They accuse the holy Mother Church of misinterpreting his teachings to her, in the organization of this holy institution. And they do not hesitate to aggravate the accusation by averring that for fifteen hundred years of her lifetime,—yes, for her whole life—she not only failed to understand him, and to fulfil his command, but that she actually organized a system of folly and idolatry instead of the divine institution he commanded her to organize, and which *he intended to instruct her to organize!!!* The Church believes not so—she teaches not so. She believes the Word of God on his veracity alone. She will not allow human rhetoric, with its hyperboles, its tropes—nor with any of its figures—to contradict her divine Master. Hence it is that, first, and alone, and forever, she believes the Word of God to be infallible against all human sense; and on his veracity alone.

But, secondly, the Church *may believe*, and teach her children, that the Word of God is true, as spoken to her, *because* the appropriate sense to which the revelation was made, and that sense from which divine faith cometh, cannot understand the uttering of his voice in any other way. His language is meaningless, if another sense than hearing be allowed to contradict it and the voice of God at once.

If another sense be allowed to interpret, even, the voice of God, then his voice and the voice of nature both are superseded. For *nature*, in her power to hear, her sense recognizing voice, is stigmatized as strongly and directly as the holy Mother Church, in these accusations against her purity and holiness and authority. Hearing cannot understand the voice —Word of God—in any other way than the way the Church teaches. And if error had never called any other sense to teach and interpret the divine Word than hearing—by which faith cometh—she never could have seduced men to discredit the teaching of the holy Catholic Church. That sense with which God endowed us to recognize and understand sound—voice—language—had to be discredited *before* the Church could be discredited. Have her accusers looked this fact in the face? Before error, in any of its forms, can discredit the teaching of the holy Church to her children, it has to betray men into the belief that taste can teach the divine Word—that touch can teach it—that sight can teach it—that it can be taught by the smell; or that these four senses can combine their natural capacities so as to teach it, and contradict the Church in the act. Is not this a violation of the entire order of nature, as exhibited in human endow-

ments? Is it not overturning and totally *changing* the uses and functions of those organic elements of our nature we call sight, smell, taste, and touch? And if it be, then it is not the Church which teaches men a faith contrary to their senses. Her accusers are they who teach men so. Will they also look this fact calmly and candidly in the very eye of its necessity and truth? The Church teaches her children strictly in accordance with the principles of nature, in the natural order, and in accordance with the "natural fitness" of things. But she does not teach nature, nor the principle of nature, in the natural order; nor yet the natural fitness of things in this order. She teaches the Word of God as revealed to her in the beginning, and she would do so though it conflicted with every faculty of the mind, and every sense of the body, with which errorists allege that it does.

Imagine that we had no other sense than hearing; would it be possible to understand the Word of God to be in contradiction to itself, in the matter immediately in hand? Had we but the single sense by which faith cometh, it would be plainly impossible to contradict or *change* the revealed Word and infallible truth of God, in reference to the faith, and to all the faith, the Church teaches

to her children. Reason says so, experience says so, common sense says so. All these teach that the substance of body cannot be reached and comprehended by them, even in the natural order; and the claim set up for their jurisdiction in the supernatural order is simply absurd. The supremacy of the natural over the spiritual is animalizing too much; it is inverting all the dignity and grandeur, all the purity and holiness, that we know. Which of the senses has taught us what is the substance of light? When light invades and irritates the delicate tissues of the inflamed eye, why do not the senses, why do not sight and touch, arrest the substantial arm of the oppressor, and lead him away from the organs of sight? It is alike against reason and the senses that the bold intruder should inflict useless suffering with impunity. Light penetrates everywhere, exists in all things, illuminates all; robs nothing of its vision, its rights, its power or authority, in the sphere in which God has fixed its rights, its power, and in which he has constituted its authority. But though this phenomenon we call light is so pervasive, its substance is wholly beyond all the powers and senses of man. Neither these, nor any art or science which ministers to these, can enable man to touch its substance, or even

to see its body. Yet nothing in nature, with a law from nature, can rightfully utter one word of complaint against the supremacy which light exerts in all the realms of the natural order. Let the naturalist—let the sensualist, then, tell us what is the *substance* of light, in the natural order, before he arraigns the Church for the faith and its mysteries she teaches her children in the daily eucharistic sacrifice, which she daily makes upon her altars, in obedience to the *words* of its institution. But who hath seen death? That mysterious thing we call life, when it enters our body, and so call it while it dwells there; and that which we call death, when it goes out of the body: who hath seen *it?* Who hath tested its nature and offices by smell or touch or taste? Yet it is substantial as life. Who hath seen life? There is no man of ordinary reflection, upon the sources of his knowledge, who will make the four senses the test of truth in the natural order. And there are so many mysteries of transubstantiation in this order, that it is a special wonder how it ever became a creed of any sect of professing Christians, that the fact of transubstantiation which the Church teaches her children, in the spiritual and supernatural order, is incredible *because* the testimony of the

senses fails to recognize its truth. We have shown that but one sense can, in the order of nature, take cognizance of it, and that that one never fails to teach exactly what the Church teaches concerning transubstantiation. The naturalist or the sensualist who impugns the teaching of the Church on this account, is a very careless or a very undevout worshipper at the altars of nature. There are facts of transubstantiation in nature which should induce the sincere and instructed worshipper at her shrines to approach the living mysteries of God, revealed in the supernatural order, with the simple reverence of a little child. And if this be true of the mere sensualist (by courtesy, the mere naturalist), what shall we say of those who profess to be Christians, and who yet arraign the Church with more vindictiveness than does the sensualist for her faith and teaching? The truth is, that facts of transubstantiation are so numerous—so universal in the natural order—that if it were not a question whether it be true in the supernatural, we should think (if indulging antecedent objections) that if there were no facts of transubstantiation revealed in the spiritual order, that then the argument would be that the faith revealed was not true, *because* facts of this character did not occupy a place

in the spiritual as well as in the natural order of things. Almost every fact we see in the natural order is a fact of transubstantiation.

Let any man seriously consider the arrangements and phenomena in the order of nature around him. Can he find any thing whatever, but which is at once the result and the evidence of transubstantiation? St. Paul illustrates an article of revealed faith by one of these facts of transubstantiation, which is found in the natural order. In the fifteenth chapter of first Corinthians, verses 35, 36, 37, 38, we read: "But some will say, how are the dead raised up? And with what body do they come? Fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die: And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body which shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or some other grain: but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed its own body." Verse 40: "There are also celestial bodies and bodies terrestrial; but the glory of the celestial is one, and the glory of the terrestrial is another." Verse 42: "So also is the resurrection of the dead: It is sown in corruption: it is raised in incorruption." Verses 43, 44: "It is sown in dishonor; it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power: it is sown a natural body; it

is raised a spiritual body. *There is a natural body and there is a spiritual body.*" Let us, for a brief moment, reflect on this fact of transubstantiation in the natural order, given by St. Paul to show the Pagan mind the reasonableness of the resurrection of the body. Let us do so with special reference to the teaching of the Church in the eucharistic sacrifice. Let the mind throughout, as its eyes glance from the natural to the spiritual, and from the spiritual to the natural, dwell with severest thought and profoundest consideration, and with intense scrutiny, upon the peculiarly single and simple fact that SUBSTANCE, the *thing*, the *being* of all phenomena, cannot be grasped by the senses: that it eludes all human power and conception, except that of faith, which closets with it as a friend, and takes it to her bosom as an offspring (as it is) of her own. A grain of wheat is sown; it dies, and quickens in the act; it arises a blade of grass; it grows to bloom; it lives to maturity; perfects its seed—it is grain again. Bread is made of this grain; it is eaten by man; and, by eating it he hath flesh and blood; he hath natural life. What then is the SUBSTANCE of this grain? The grass? The grain again? It is seen, in the process, to be human flesh and blood. The substance,

then, of the grain is the flesh and blood of graminivorous animals. This may not be its ultimate substance. But we perceive it is either an intermediate or *actual* (that is an *ultimate or final*) substance of the grain. It was such when it was sown; it was such when it died and quickened, in the very article of its death; it was such in its change from grass to grain again; and from this to bread—the substance of which, in the natural order, was converted immediately into human flesh and blood,—it was such. Here is a fact of transubstantiation in the natural order, which is so common as to attract no remark, even from acute materialists, and its mysteries are inexplicable; but it is impossible to disbelieve them,—every sensualist credits these (natural) mysteries as readily and as fully as the devout Catholic. Yet they elude his senses. These, in the several progressive changes from one condition to another, until the actual substance of human flesh and blood, are nowhere grasped by any sense of man. But the result is, from the first of the series of events to the last, that the grain comes to bread, and the substance of bread is immediately changed into animal flesh and blood. How? By a fiat of nature: by an incomprehensible fact of transubstantiation in the natural order. You ate simple

bread; it looked like bread; it tasted like bread; it had the touch and smell of bread; yet in its substance it was flesh and blood. Sensualist and naturalist! Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you "that the mystery of divine faith can be true? What, then, is the substance of bread in the natural order? It is human flesh and blood. This is a natural miracle. It is produced by a single word of nature. Her fiat in one word of command, produces it. It is grand and admirable, beautiful and inexplicable; but so credible, that even the sensualist will not deny it. And this natural miracle, men, by the habit of non-reflection, without consideration, believe without doubt (*because* they are familiar with it, and never heard it questioned—perhaps never discussed) that they understand it; believe that it is a fact grasped by their reason, by their common sense and experience; but it is not so. They know no more of it than they do of any spiritual miracle. Nothing more: philosophically, and artistically, and scientifically, they are alike ignorant of the miracles in both orders. But they do not understand the natural miracle on reflection, and cannot comprehend it; yet they cannot discredit it: they are obliged to believe it, as a natural fact and a natural miracle. And so they are

obliged, by the word of God, to believe any mystery and miracle in the supernatural order; and this, alone, because his word is the pledge for its truth and the security for its reality. For he who discredits the divine word withdraws himself from all moral and religious obligation; and must, in the future, take the judgment and penalty of the disbeliever, which is eternal condemnation.

When men, who profess to credit divine revelation, say that any revealed mystery of faith is contrary to *their* experience, and therefore untrue, they are probably unaware of the terrible implications their assertions carry along with their direct negative purpose. A simple question will unfold the hidden blasphemy contained in such sayings: when did these men in their experience, hear God utter a falsehood? And so of their reason? And so of their common sense? Their reason, experience, and common sense, have been fully shown to be false, as standards of divine truth. The awful logic of begging the question in contradiction of the divine word, is here fully disclosed, by a single and very simple question. The accusers of the Church should show, as a fact, by evidence overriding the attestations of all the saints from the Apostles till now, that there was no revelation made at all;

instead of assuming there was none, *because*, by an act of inference from their human endowments, they come to the conclusion that the revelation is contrary to certain of these endowments; namely, their reason, their experience, and their common sense. Hence the question never is, what is man's reason? What is his experience? What is his common sense? Never! The question *always* is, What has God revealed to his holy Church?

But we come nearer to the insufficiency of taste, touch, sight, and smell, as criterions of divine revelation, than we have yet been. We have been gradually feeling our way, as it were, up to this place. It is the purpose of this section to satisfy the conscience, the intellect,—all the powers of every candid, reflecting professor of a belief in Christianity, that these senses are not the standard or rule of divine faith. *The* standard! They are no standard; no rule of divine faith. This proposition we bring to an instant and decisive test. THE RESURRECTION FROM THE DEAD: a life of the soul and body forever, with God is the ultimate, the real, the essential, the fundamental FACT of Christianity. Has the sensualist or the naturalist seen this fact? Has he tasted it? Has he touched it? Has he smelled it? Preposterous questions!

one and all exclaim. But, on the sensualist's and naturalist's rule of interpreting divine revelation, no man of sense can explain why they are not, not only, sensible and reasonable questions, but also questions (each) pointing to a necessary fact. Why then are they preposterous? Simply because the sensualist's and naturalist's rule of interpreting divine revelation is not only false, but unqualifiedly absurd. The resurrection from the dead is not a fact cognizable by the natural senses, which we negative as a rule of faith. It is not cognizable by reason; nor by experience; nor by common sense. It is a revealed fact: we believe it on the veracity of God alone. That Infidels and Atheists—that the Sensualists—should assert any fact of divine revelation to be contrary to the senses (meaning taste, touch, sight, and smell), and therefore false, is not wonderful: it is a natural development of their sensuous minds, and a necessary unfolding of sensualism. It is what we expect; and we would be astonished if they were to take the spiritual view of revelation which faith teaches, or any spiritual view at all of man's title, by revealed facts, to a future home in the supernatural world. The Atheist and Sensualist cannot ascend from the natural order of things in which he lives, to a

spiritual fact, in the spiritual order of things, in which God lives;—hence his "Credibles" and "Incredibles" are all measured by the standards of sensuality in the natural, material order. From his habits of thought, and his customary ideas of what is pure, spiritually pure and holy; and from his estimate of what the Christian calls eternity, it would be very strange—certainly contrary to his experience—if the sensualist made any other interpretation than he does of divine faith.

That any one claiming that Christianity is credible and a divinely revealed system of truth, and that the resurrection from the dead is a fact of Christianity, should array against the facts of divine faith revealed to the Apostles such a standard of credibility or rule of faith as these (negatived) senses, and to which the Church objects (as a standard of divine truth), is not readily accounted for; it is a mystery how a Christian mind ever came to be deluded by a standard so deceptive as to contradict at once both nature and supernature. It surely was not adopted all at once and generally, at the beginning of the Reformation. It must have been the work of time, and a necessity of the progress of error. Men must have been driven to it, originally, as a subterfuge and a shift, to shield themselves

from truths and arguments they could not meet and answer, even, by respectable sophisms. In fact, we know this was really the case; for both Henry VIII. and Luther clung to the faith of the Church from which they apostatized, on the doctrine of the eucharist, with great pertinacity, and with more endearing regard than either was thought capable of exhibiting for any principle which conflicted with his passions. But howsoever the accusers of the Church came by this sensual standard, and how quietly soever they may have entertained and cherished them as a part of their *traditionary* faith.—Their traditionary faith!—it surely behooves them to examine its foundation in nature, in reason, in common sense, in experience, and in the Word of God. The sensual rule contradicts every one of these, within their respective spheres of authority. It contradicts not only these, but it contradicts —wipes out, annihilates—the fundamental opinion on which Protestantism rests and is established. This fundamental opinion, so wiped out, is this: that all they believe, all their opinions must be found written in the Old Testament and Gospels and Epistles. Now, have the accusers of the Church ever recognized that the sensual rule of divine faith —which we have been negativing throughout

this section—is a traditionary rule, and one not found recorded in either of the Gospels or either of the Epistles? It is so, whether they have recognized it or not; for it is nowhere intimated in them that the question between the Church and Protestants, on the institution, nature, and office of the holy eucharist, is to be decided by an appeal from any ambiguous *words* in the revelation of God, to the direct decision of smell, taste, touch, and sight, as these exist in man. No one of the Gospels nor any one of the Epistles declares, by any plain statement, nor by any indication or hint, that these (four) senses are a standard or rule of divine faith. This is true—it will not be disputed. And being true, it thence clearly appears that the accusers of the Church have a traditionary faith or opinion which overturns the basis upon which their fabric of religion is erected. That concerns them. What concerns us, in the fact, is that they should be a little more placable towards the children of the Church for their traditionary faith, taught to them by their holy Mother, and which the great commission, on its face, and by its terms, shows that her blessed Lord and Saviour revealed to her and commanded her to teach to all nations, even unto the end of the world.

SECTION XIV.

CONCLUSION.

THE QUESTION. THE QUESTION NEVER IS, WHAT IS MAN'S REASON? HIS EXPERIENCE? HIS COMMON SENSE? OR HIS TASTES AND OPINIONS? BUT THE QUESTION ALWAYS IS, EVER WAS, WHAT HAS GOD REVEALED? THE SUPREMACY OF FAITH IN THE NATURAL ORDER IS A FACT TAUGHT BY ALL OUR NATURAL KNOWLEDGE. AND IN THE SUPERNATURAL ORDER THE SUPREMACY OF FAITH IS A MATTER OF NECESSITY. OUR NATURAL AND MENTAL CONSTITUTIONS GIVE UNDOUBTED EVIDENCE TO THESE PROPOSITIONS.

THAT what is the reason, the sense, and experience of man cannot be a matter of divine revelation, is most evident. Any notion of things, approaching to slight clearness and distinctness, will satisfy any one of this truth. For what is divine revelation? It is a *new* fact, or system of facts, existing in the supernatural order, and, before its promulgation to, hidden from men. This divine system is one that concerns the relations which man sustains to, and the duties and obligations which he owes to, the supernatural order, from which the revelation emanates, and upon the proper maintenance of which relations and the right

discharge of which duties and obligations depends his eternal happiness. This fact, or system of facts, *before* existing in the divine order, in the fulness of time was made known, through the sacerdotal order, to men by the blessed Saviour.* This was God making known to men a new fact or a new system in facts, which was new in their order, for the the sake of their eternal happiness. Hence the revelation was an act of divine love and mercy and condescension. This is a sufficient account of divine revelation for the purposes of this section; and, so far, it is an accurate and perfect account of it. That this did not concern, or was not a matter of human reason, human experience, and human common sense, is a self-evident truth; for these faculties of men were not facts existing in the divine or supernatural order, and hidden from him until the advent of the blessed Saviour, and which were then revealed to man in his (natural) order, as *new facts*, upon which his eternal happiness was founded. Man had his reason, common sense, and experience always, without the help of revelation. He had them, in their fulness, before the Christian revelation of divine faith. They were as perfect

* We refer, of course, to revelations after his advent.

in their order before the revelation as afterwards. No new strength of nature was added to them by, nor did any new authority or force result to their constitution from, the revelation. Human knowledge was, of necessity, extended by the revelation. This resulted, as a matter of course, from the nature of things and the purpose of the Divinity. The natural faculties of man would have been changed or deadened if this had not been so; for every *new fact* presented to reason and common sense, and added to experience, is an extension of our knowledge to things before unknown. This is so, whether the new fact be one having its proper residence in the natural or in the supernatural order. It is a necessity of nature—of human nature—that such should be the case. Human genius, intellect, and imagination cannot evade the consequence if they would. New facts, hence, are simply new materials for the reason, the intellect, the sense, the experience to adopt and weave into new forms of knowledge. Their anterior powers, however, are not changed, but enlightened by extended knowledge. The same powers of understanding, which weave the new facts into new forms of knowledge, had woven the previous facts presented to them into that knowledge which existed in

the mind before the revelation. The very same powers of the understanding, or mind, were exercised on the old (anterior) facts that were exercised on the new. No new powers of the understanding, or mind, were needed, hence none were revealed, or rather none were created; but new facts, new materials, were presented to the mind, by which—aided and guided, as promised by the divine Revealer—it might build up a new system of knowledge, derived from a new source of facts and a spiritual order of existence. This new knowledge, derived from a spiritual source or fountain of facts, was, of course, an addition to and extension of the old knowledge existing anterior to the revelation. Now, if we be asked, Why so patient to state such obvious truths? We answer, not because we expect to teach anybody, but because we desire a distinct recognition of the facts by everybody.

Hence, then, a divine revelation was the most natural (so to speak) and benignant thing in the providence of God. It was naturally to be expected by reason, in its knowledge of its own universal weakness and debasement. It *was* expected. The prophets had foretold it. And earthly rulers dreaded the purity and sanctity of divine revelation and the head of the spiritual kingdom, whom prophetic predic-

tion had foreshadowed as one who would surely overthrow their corrupt dynasties and power. And their apprehensions were right in fact and substance, but wrong in means and the application of means; for they expected to be cast down by a new political power of extraordinary magnificence and ever-enduring authority. So they interpreted the prophets. (Men have always—as well as for the last three hundred years—been putting the teachings of their own human senses in the place of the plain instructions of the divine spirit). Pagan manners, habits, and customs, and pagan religions, have been uniformly subverted by the purity and holiness of Christianity. The sanctity and purity of the Church has crushed pagan sentiment wherever it has been permitted to make any thing like a fair contest for its subversion, for its utter abolition. And if it were possible to believe that Christianity, as revealed to the holy Mother Church, could become old or worn out; could become unfit to purify men, and make them holy, and prepare them for an eternal residence with the God of purity and sanctity; if further, it were possible for this revealed Christianity to become, not only unfit for its design, but that it would actually tend to debase and brutalize men, as pagan manners and opinions did:—

then, it would be the most natural thing in the providence of God, to expect that he would make another revelation, in mercy, to raise up to a kinship with himself the imbruted inhabitants of the world. Philosophers, who believed in a supreme (personal) God, would expect, and prophets who speak for him would predict, that in the fulness of time, a new revelation, to enlighten man's reason and to extend his knowledge, would be made to him, so as to conform his will to the divine will and divine economy, and thus to purify, elevate, and enlighten man, in the natural order, and thus to restore him to his lost relations to the spiritual order, in such manner as to fit his being for a communion and companionship with his Maker; and to enjoy eternal happiness in his kingdom and councils and providence forever. All who believe in a God would expect this, in the supposed but impossible case. But no reasonable man, guided by reason and common sense, would discredit and denounce the new revelation, when made, because it was contrary to his reason, senses, and experience. This would be to falsify the hope of philosophers, the predictions of prophets, the expectations of mankind, and the mercy of God. Every revelation from God to man, be it remembered, is a mercy to man. Hence

one folly of arraying any of the powers of the mind, as such, against a divine revelation. Such an act is making a human war upon divine mercy. It is denying God. It is to question his supremacy of mercy, his wisdom and his economy in the administration of his supernatural providence. The very same principles, with an additional energy of reason, prevail against the tastes and opinions of men being concerned, as arbiters and judges, in the truth and fitness of a revelation from God. The tastes, the senses, the opinions of men, are the peculiar objects which a divine revelation would be expected to overrule and revolutionize, in their moral and religious aspects :—in their assumptions of power either to regulate or teach moral and religious truth. If human sense, taste, and opinions were in accordance with the will of God, it would be difficult to frame a reason and a necessity for a revelation. These, then, cannot be consulted upon a question of divine revelation. They cannot be allowed to speak to the question of its fitness or unfitness to the dignity and supreme majesty and wisdom of God. The revelation is made against them. It judges them; not they it. It demands their overthrow—their total subversion, in their assumed relation to the supernatural, as judges and

teachers of the truth. And the revelation imperiously requires and unqualifiedly enacts that they be *changed*,—be born anew. And they are told by the divine Revealer, that it is a divine decree in the divine order, that unless they "be born again they cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven," the means of obtaining which he came to give them. Thus reason plainly teaches that human tastes, senses, and opinions, cannot be concerned as judges, but only as culprits, in the truth and reality of a divine revelation and its institutions and observances. The natural tastes and opinions of men have decried revelation from the first; and they always will hold the divine law in detestation. The natural mind is at enmity with God; it is not subject to his law, and neither can it be. It must have its knowledge extended by faith in a divine revelation before it can be subject to the law of God, and be at peace with his will, and in communion with his love. Hence the question as to divine revelation, has never been: what are human tastes and opinions? But the question is, and has always been: what has God revealed?

What were the traditionary articles (facts) of faith to which the blessed Saviour referred when he spoke to the holy Mother Church, and commanded her to teach as follows: "All

power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I HAVE COMMANDED you; and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen?" This is always the question. The investigation of what were these traditionary facts or articles of faith, thus recalled to the notice of the Apostles, and which he commanded them, who were his chosen sacerdotal order, to teach forever, is always the simple inquiry; and nothing else is within the field of examination at all. The question is, what faith, and what duties and obligation of faith, *had been before* revealed which were now thus commanded to be taught and observed for all time? And, this faith is to be taken on the veracity of God alone, speaking through his authorized and duly commissioned teachers. The divine teaching, or sacerdotal order, whom he alone commissioned to teach, and whom he alone authorized to teach "all things, whatsoever he had commanded them,"—this is the order of men whom he promised "to guide into all truth," and to whom he promised the Holy Ghost, "to bring all things to their remembrance, whatsoever he had spoken

to them." This divinely appointed teaching order, is that to which he promised to be and remain with forever, when he said, as an encouragement to them to enter upon the sacerdotal office, "Lo, I AM *with you* always, even unto the end of the world." This divinely appointed sacerdotal order is that alone through which the traditionary faith, which the blessed Lord commanded to teach and observe, can be ascertained. This sacerdotal order is alone to teach and expound the word of God. It is his only witness. It is his only, his single organ. And the reason is most obvious: The divine revelation was made to them; it was deposited with them; it rests and exists in the mind of no other order of men, so as to be brought out to remembrance by the Holy Ghost, when in the providence of God any of its traditions are peculiarly required to be exactly stated and rigidly enforced. No other order of men, no other men, have either authority or promise in the matter. If the promise of Christ is to be believed, and if his command is to be regarded, this is both a simple fact and a fact of reason. If this sacerdotal order, thus consecrated by the blessed Saviour to teach forever, has ceased to exist in the purity and authority with which it was endowed by its divine institutor and

consecrator, it is a lamentable and awful fact. Is there, now, no Church on earth teaching the very faith and keeping the very observances which the blessed God commanded to be taught and observed *forever?* Has this holy Mother Church corrupted and died? Have the gates of hell prevailed against this Church, so commissioned and so guaranteed by the assurance of her Divine Founder's word, that he would be with her always to the end of the world; that the Holy Ghost would be with her as a comforter; that this adorable person of the Trinity would be with her as a remembrancer, so that she should never forget any of "the all things whatsoever" he had communicated (revealed) to her; that the Holy Spirit would be sent to her to GUIDE her into all Truth? Has the holy Mother Church, thus divinely assured and guaranteed, ceased to be the Mother of Christ's children? Are they left orphans? And are all the children of men without a divinely organized, and divinely commissioned, and divinely instructed teacher of the traditionary faith so revealed to the holy Mother Church? Have all God's sacred promises and solemn assurances to her failed? Terrible calamity! When did this amazing tragedy occur, which lost to the natural and to the spiritual worlds the fruits of the sacrifice of

the Son of God? When did the blessed Jesus lose his own select and chosen witness to the teachings of his life, to the fact of his death and to the reality of his resurrection? Whenever this astonishing and calamitous event took place, the solid globe must have trembled, as though it would rend itself in twain; it must have been smitten with darkness, and overspread with spiritual death; moral paralysis and intellectual maniacism must have appalled the race of man, when the power and diabolicity of hell thus struck from their sphere and abiding place in the Church, both the Son of God, who is the resurrection and the life of man, and the Holy Spirit, by whom the ever Virgin—the Immaculate Mother of God, conceived the divine Redeemer. This period of natural, moral, and spiritual ruin, when the Divine Founder of the Church was compelled to suffer eternal banishment from her organization, to forego his communion with her life, to abandon his promise to his spouse, contained in the words: "Lo, I am with *you* always, even unto the end of the world;" this period when she was finally lost to her original purity and forever degraded in spiritual desolation; this period when he was driven away from her, by her consummation of impurity, and when she was left a death-stricken widow, in the power

and within the foul embraces of Satan; this must have been a time terrifically marked with natural, moral, and spiritual convulsions, a period in the world's history, marked so deeply, so ineffaceably by the accursed foot-prints of the prince of darkness, that no son of man can fail to trace, everywhere, the infernal tracks, the horrid engravings, the hideous monuments commemorating, at once, the doom of the Church, the promises of Christ to his divine spouse, and the hopeless, irrecoverable ruin of the human family. But, blessed be God and his holy name! no such tragic calamity—overwhelming the Church, and her Divine Founder, with sad desolation and destruction—has occurred. No such monuments of a woe-struck world exist. The very Church, with her one God, ONE FAITH, one baptism, which he established to teach and observe all things which he had commanded,—that very Church he abides with yet, and will comfort forever. His word of promise has not failed, and shall not forever. His holy Mother Church has always taught, and does now, and forever will, teach the very faith, and will verily observe "all things, to do them," which he had commanded her to teach and to observe *before* his ascension. In youthful vigor she is as fresh; in the purity of her vir-

ginal teaching she is as immaculate; in child-like obedience she is as faithful; in all the devotions of sanctified maternity, she is as uncontaminated with *any* error, and as holy, as she was on the day when he espoused her to himself, and introduced her to the nations as "The bride, the Lamb's wife," to be the sacred mother of all the earth-born children of his Father.

But to return for a moment to the terrific supposition that this holy Mother Church has succumbed to the genius of hell, and that its gates have prevailed against her, and that her sphere of spiritual teaching and power in the world is a desolated waste, is a field where the promises of God lie in the wild confusion of destruction; suppose all this: what then? It results from the (supposed) fact that whoever now appears as a witness for God, to prove, to perpetuate the facts of faith revealed to his Mother Church, is a perjurer: that any institution calling itself, claiming to be, his Church —his witness to the truth, claiming to teach by his express ordinance, authority, and command, is a pretender and a usurper: is Anti-Christ: is the impure lady of Babylon, arrayed in her finest, but stolen, scarlet. But what of this? What then? What then is the necessary, the naked fact, on the conditions supposed?

What becomes of the numerous—almost numberless sectaries who wag the finger of scorn, and who curl the lip of derision at the scarlet lady? Manifestly none of them received the deposit of faith, originally revealed to the holy Mother Church, from the Apostles. They do not claim, even, to so have received it; they hold in an ineffable contempt, in utter derision, the idea that there either is or can be an order of men who are the successors to the Apostles, and who, by their consecration, are in unity with them; and, hence, one—the very same—holy Mother Church which the blessed Jesus commissioned to teach his revelation. They make no claim themselves to be this Church, and they will allow no one else to make it. But if they did claim to be the successors of the Apostles, who were consecrated to teach the mysteries of divine faith, it would be impossible that they could make good the claim; for they do not reach back, through time, far enough, by fifteen hundred years, to be their successors and the recipients of the traditionary deposit of faith which was revealed to the holy Mother Church, and which she was organized to teach, and commanded to teach, to all nations forever. Thus, upon the principles of the accusers of the Church themselves, and upon their assump-

tions that the holy Catholic Church is not the authorized teacher of divine revelation committed to the Apostles, it follows, as a necessary fact, that they themselves are false witnesses and usurpers, and that there is no divine, and therefore no infallible teacher of God's Word. This conclusion is too sweeping; it is too terribly blasphemous; it is too blasting to the hopes which the children of men have in eternity, built upon the promises of God. It leaves the world without either an authorized or an infallible teacher of divine revelation. It makes the promises of God to be lies; for he promised the Apostolic Church that he organized, at the moment of its institution, that she should never fail. He promised *that* Church to be with her until the consummation of all things. When he organized his Apostolic Church to teach all things whatsoever he had commanded her, he then promised to be with her unto the end of the world: he promised to abide with her forever; for he said to her, "Lo, I AM with YOU always, even unto the end of the world." He especially and plainly pledged his word that he would send the Holy Ghost to be her guide for a single purpose; and that to guide her into all truth, and to bring to her remembrance all things whatsoever he had spoken to her.

Now, the accusation that this holy Apostolic Church has become Anti-Christ and the scarlet lady of Babylon, is a simple, a single, a certain blasphemous reproach and contradiction of the Word of God. From whence the sacrilegious conclusion of the Church's accusers against which we protest? Not from a known, but yet from a traditionary malice. Not from a deliberative, willing love of false accusation, how terribly soever false it really is, but from a traditionary imposition, alike injurious to the hearts and understandings of those who suffer alone from perpetuating the original crime. For we trust, now, at this day, known malice, lovingly and deliberately cherished in false accusations, uttered with a spiteful design and deceitful intent to slander the holy Catholic Church, may be discarded, as a general thing, from our minds when we are dealing with injurious accusations against our holy Mother and our own faith. But whence come these false accusations, not generally known to be such by those who utter them? The answer is obvious and patent to every one who has carefully examined how dexterously Cæsar, in the incipient stages of the Reformation, veiled his crafty and bloody purposes of state, under the semblances of zeal for a *new* religion, to vin-

dicate, as he, with insidious cunning, said, the rights of mind and man from the oppression of the Church established by the blessed Redeemer. Any one who has trailed Cæsar's track, beslimed with blood, all along his subtle windings of malignant artifice, and through the theology of sectaries, will most readily perceive the actual source, the real origin, of the accusations, which are at once unjust to the teachings of the Church and to the character of her accusers. They come from Cæsar. He and his parasites deluded men into the original and fatal mistake, which is now the traditionary opinion of the Church's accusers, that human reason, that common sense, that experience—that human senses and endowments—are, in some sort, standards of divine faith, or criterions, in a similar sort, of the truth in the written word of divine revelation. And it was this swallowing of the crafty illusion and wily deception, which take human sense and endowments for divine revelation, or for valid standards of it, that first produced apostasy; and then, in its origin, deeply malignant slander and false accusation against the Church, to justify the apostasy.

And though the original and known malice, at this day, does not generally accompany unjust accusations against the Church, yet

their traditionary calumny remains, though stripped of the originally known and the originally cherished malignity inspired by Cæsar's minions. The theological error—the error of traditionary opinion—which the accusers of the Church always commit, is in taking human reason, human sense—any human endowments—as the standards of divine faith, instead of the apostolic teaching of the facts themselves, of which the divine revelation of faith consisted. In briefer phrase, the error consists in taking human opinion for divine revelation. In still stricter phrase, and brief as accurate, the grand error which the accusers of the Church commit in regard to divine faith is this: they believe *their construction* of the written Word *to be the mind of God*, in divine revelation. And yet, in the nature of things, and in the natural order, and in the natural eyesight, as it were, the two things are incompatible and necessarily contradictories. Put this opinion into the expressions of a creed and see how violative of reason and the canons of logic it is: "My CONSTRUCTION of the written Word IS THE MIND OF GOD in his divine revelation." There is scarcely any one so ignorant and so illiterate, as not to perceive the fallacy of taking his construction (*opinion* of its meaning) of a

revelation, for the mind, the intent, and will of the Revealer, expressed in the revelation itself. And yet this has been the opinion of the Church's accusers from their origin till now. This error—this rule of human opinion, the cardinal principles of which are, that reason, that experience, that common sense are, in some sort, rules of divine faith, and, in a similar sort, the true rule of interpreting the mind, the will, and intention of God, in the *Scriptures* of divine revelation: this error and this rule—these human endowments—are never the question; and we submit that this is now too plainly true to admit of a serious dispute, based on the true canons of discussion, and relieved of all passion and declamation.

The rule of human opinion (as we shall now, for brevity, style it) is not only sacrilegious when applied to facts of revelation in the spiritual order, but it is subversive of the real principles of human nature in the natural order. It prevents the nature and destroys the functions of those faculties it vainly summons to its aid, when it assaults the Church for usurping their rights; namely, the faculties of reason, experience, and common sense. This rule of human opinion overturns *the* law of our being, on which all our knowledge is founded, both in the natural and spiritual

orders. We cease to defend now, for a while, and turn accuser. And we repeat the accusation, and desire it noted in the fulness of its distinctness and force, that the rule of human opinion,—either as a standard of divine faith *in its entirety*, or as the interpreter of the divine Word in the written revelation,—"overturns the law of our being on which all our knowledge rests, both in the natural and spiritual orders." Or, in the words of the caption to this section, "the supremacy of faith in the natural order is a fact taught by all our knowledge; but in the spiritual order the supremacy of faith is a necessity." Even among facts of reason, faith is supreme. For when reason develops *a new* fact, from other facts, by any of her recognized processes of action, faith seizes the fact so developed and stamps it with the seal of her truth, before reason concludes as to its absolute veracity. Reason, therefore, does not, and cannot, admit the legitimacy of her own children, born of her own womb, until faith presents them to her as baptisms of her own truth. This is a fact, inherent in the constitution of things, and thoroughly stamped upon the essence of our mental organization, which we want marked, by candor, and not by partisan heat and declamation. What is the rule of faith

in the natural order, when a new fact—a fact before unobserved and unknown—is presented to the mind in the order of nature? And which fact no genius or power of men can analyze—unravel so as to comprehend its philosophy and understand its nature and essence? Will any religionist in the world maintain that such a fact must be contradicted? Will he assert that reason demands that its existence must be denied as a thing that is against her authority and supremacy? Will he affirm, in the presence of a pretty, prattling, smiling child, who is admiring this novelty of nature, that the thing does not exist; and that the pretty little babbler is making an abolition of common sense by believing that it sees an existing thing, and enjoys what it sees? When this child shall have attained manhood, retaining his knowledge that he did see and did enjoy the sight of the novel fact, will this religionist accuse any of his faculties for misleading him, and hence warn the grown man that he must not add the fact to his experience, because it is incredible (from experience) that any such fact ever did exist? If any religionist or learned philosopher were so to maintain, it would be impossible for him to convince the world, or even a "little child," that he founded his "credibles" and his "in-

credibles" upon the laws of human nature and the constitution of the human mind. He could not convince any one, justly claiming rationality, that whoever *did* believe the new fact, did thereby act contrary to reason, to common sense, and experience. On the contrary, he who gave credence to the fact, and interweaved it into the web of his previous information and knowledge, as material for his reason, as an extension of that knowledge which he previously had, concerning the order of nature, would be the man who would, and the "little child" who would act, and obtain credit for acting, in obedience to reason and the constitution of his nature. Insanity alone would discredit a fact in the order of nature, because of its incomprehensibility,—because men could not *rationalize* it, so to speak, on the ideas of his old knowledge of anteriorly observed facts. So far forth, then, the Church does not violate the LAWS OF NATURE, nor any law constituting the human mind, because she teaches facts as revelations from God, which all the endowments and capacities of the human mind cannot comprehend. Instead of this, her teaching, though not of things of nature, affirms and upholds every principle of nature and of human nature, which she is accused of abasing and destroying. She always teaches

in rigid accordance with these principles of nature, though she does not teach facts of the order to which they belong, nor yet the knowledge of the things which they teach. They enlighten the understanding and extend its knowledge as to natural facts and the philosophy of things in the natural order. The Church enlightens the understanding and extends its knowledge as to supernatural facts, and the duties and obligations thence arising to cultivate the mind, and discipline the heart and the will in harmony with the relations which the divine revelation shows to exist between moral beings in the natural order and spiritual beings in the supernatural order.

Time and thought would be uselessly expended in a further elaboration and exposition of the point immediately on hand. We submit it as a finished thing, as a matter impregnably established, that the rule of human opinion overturns the law of our being on which all our knowledge is founded, both in the natural and the supernatural orders; and that the supremacy of faith in the natural order is taught us by all our knowledge.

We now proceed to the advocacy and maintenance of the statement that, "The supremacy of faith in the supernatural order, is a matter of necessity." And this law binding us to the

spiritual world, and holding man in his rightful relations to the spiritual beings who rule and inhabit it, is not an arbitrary rule and a technical necessity, which infringes upon the free exercise of any portion of our moral nature and intelligent endowments. It is a natural thing, as well as "a necessity." In other words, it is a natural law of our being that the tie which subsists between man and the spiritual world, and which links and binds him, naturally and rightfully, to the supreme God, and inhabitants of that world, is faith; and that this ligament binding man in the natural order to God and angels in the supernatural order, is one of supremacy over every other that connects us with supernatural, spiritual beings. The supremacy of faith in the supernatural order, is a necessity, and a supreme natural necessity. It exists in the very elements of spiritual facts that faith should be supreme, in their order. In the simplest element and profoundest analysis (so to speak, though not with rigid correctness) of a supernatural fact, faith must reign supreme, —absolutely and universally supreme. Nature forbids, by her inexorable commands and irreversible decrees, that it should be otherwise. A fact, existing in the supernatural order, can only be made known, in the natural order, by

a divine revelation. Reason,—no endowment of the human mind can unfetter itself of its earth-born shackles, and robe itself at once in superhuman and supernatural power; and so wing its way into the divine counsels, in the order of heaven; and *there*, by communion and intelligible intercourse with Divinity obtain a knowledge of supernatural facts; and then clothed with these, "in raiment above the brightness of the sun," fly down to earth and impart the heavenly acquired facts to men. This, all will concede, is a feat and a fact too grand for all human endowments. The divine Mind, then, must reveal supernatural facts to men, *because* it is impossible for them to acquire the facts for themselves. Reason will certainly affirm this as an original decree of her own, which can never be altered or changed while she remains true to her normal character. These divinely revealed facts, of necessity, will be totally *new* to man, in his order. No faculty of his, before the revelation, could have had any cognizance of any of them; otherwise they would not be a divine revelation. This is, also, an unalterable decree of reason, in union with all human endowments. Divine revelation is, therefore, a making known to all man's powers *new facts*, which exist in a *new order;* that is, they are new so far as man and the

natural order is concerned. But when they shall be revealed, how says man that they are "incredible," *because* contrary to his reason, sense, and experience! What does he mean by such an affirmation? So far as he means to discredit faith in the revelation, by such an assertion, he is using language in a loose and inexact sense, and is deceiving himself by his own abuse of terms. The assertion is sheer nonsense, unmitigated absurdity. For it affirms an original or prior status of fact, of reason, sense, and experience in his mind, which the revelation is contrary to—which it contradicts. And yet from both the nature and terms of the revelation, its facts *are new*, informatory, an extension of knowledge; leaving the status of the natural mind, in its natural organization of its powers, in the same normal condition in which it found them.

The deception is a self-imposed one,—so shallow in itself, so contradictory of those laws of nature and the human mind, by which knowledge is extended, that it is the most extraordinary mental phenonema of the age, in which we live, that any one of respectable sense and culture, should abuse his mind by so coarse a fallacy. Millerism, Mormonism, or any other ism, does not more surely and effectually override ordinary sense than does this sophism.

We boast of this as an age of progress and reason. How do we progress, if at all? Certainly not by discrediting new facts—new discoveries among the, heretofore, unexplored recesses of nature, which include all human sciences. Whoever would lay down the sophism in the way of mere human progression,—namely, that all new facts, or facts which had not before been cognized, are false and contrary to reason, sense, and experience, *because* they are new, would be deemed insane beyond the hope of redemption. He would be held as one who, for his own mad purposes, had perverted language, in its plain uses, and obvious and constant import. The very terms of our tongue, which teach us all we know of experience, or of any faculty of the mind, would thus be so far abused as to subvert all the knowledge by which we identify experience and distinguish it from progress. Experience is a relative term, teaching us to identify what we have observed in the past, so as to divide it from what we shall observe hereafter. It marks the past in its relations to the unexplored future. So it is with reason, and so it is with all our endowments; for all these have their past (their experience), their present, and their relations to the future, as well as the thing we call experience, itself. This threefold

relation, existing among the faculties of our nature, is destroyed by the insane fallacy we are contemning. Faith, then, in a supernatural revelation is a necessity. The supremacy of faith in the supernatural order is clearly seen to be a necessity, unless we deny the supernatural order altogether. Supernatural facts cannot reach down to us by any other channel. And we have no other faculty or power by which to reach up to them than "through faith, without which it is impossible to please God." Hence it is, also, that the supremacy of faith is a necessity of our nature. It is the only faculty among our endowments, by which the supernatural can be made manifest to us as a fact. It is the power by which a knowledge of supernatural things is brought to the human soul, through the instrumentality of hearing. The supernatural facts must be revealed if they exist, or they can never reach the human understanding. But when they are revealed, they still cannot reach the human understanding without faith. For if the human soul, with all its endowments, discredit the revelation, then the effects of it are lost to man. Divinely revealed facts, which are immediately discredited as human fabrications and delusions of sense, are as fruitless to the human soul as if they were not

divine, and had not been revealed. Reason and all our endowments decree this, and will submit to no reversal of the decree. We cheerfully submit now that we have made good the statement that, "The supremacy of faith in the supernatural order is a matter of necessity." That inherently, in the nature and reason of things—in our own human nature—it *must* be so; and that every faculty and every endowment of our minds justifies the necessity and decrees its existence, with resistless force, and absolute energy and power.

How then do some say that reason, sense, and experience, are supreme; and that the divine faith the Church teaches her children must be discredited whenever human opinion, as enlightened by these human endowments, makes a decree against the credibility of divine revelation and the Church's teaching? The accusers of the Church cannot say so, because these constituents of mind, entering into this human opinion, are supreme over faith; for they are not so. Each of them, on the plainest principles of their constitutional relations to the entire soul, renounces the supremacy claimed for it. They all, together, accuse those who make the claim for them, of subverting the very principles of our nature these faculties were given us to maintain and uphold.

They all, furthermore, decree that, in order to elevate them to the supremacy claimed for them, language, the instrument of thought and idea, has to be abused and perverted; that its obvious import and clearest relations to the facts of the universe, have to be destroyed in order to consummate the usurpation of atheism which their supremacy presupposes, and which it guarantees and assures.

Having thus, too plainly for rational question, shown that those who teach contrary to the teaching of the Church, ignore nature and the endowments of humanity, and impliedly, at least, blaspheme, let us briefly sum up the mode and authority by which the Church acquired and teaches divine revelation. How, then, did she arrive at (acquire) the divinely revealed facts, which *had* been communicated to the Apostles by the divine Founder of Christianity, *before* they were commissioned, and *before* they were commanded to teach what *had* been revealed? And how does she hold and retain, and now teach these divine facts, which were planted as seed in her memory and bosom, *before* she was finally and distinctly organized to teach divine faith? The answer is contained in the very terms of the commission itself, which is the divine charter of her organization; *she arrives at the*

facts by divine apostolic teaching, if at all. But there is no "if;" the facts *can* be reached and acquired; they have always been in the custody of the Church. We suppose that reason, at least, will not deny that the children of the Church, and those who would be such, must ascertain the facts of divine revelation *now*, in the self-same manner that the pagans and Jews ascertained them in the days of the Apostles. If reason—if all our endowments—can decree any thing with infallible certainty, it will be the fact that the unconverted and the heathen must now ascertain the facts of divine revelation, which the blessed Saviour *had* communicated to the Apostles, *before* the commission or divine charter which organized the holy Mother Church, in the very same manner the Jews and pagans ascertained these facts, in the lifetime of the primitive Apostles. In other words, the children of the Church, the unconverted and the heathen, must be taught divine faith now as then. How was that? How did Jews and pagans in the apostolic age learn the facts of divine revelation? Obviously by apostolic teaching. This is a simple fact; and it is a fact of reason as well: and reason and all our faculties plainly decree its verity; and this decree is one of their irreversible ordinances. It stands

forever a law of mind, and every one of its constituents. And if reason and our other faculties stamp this law with their irreversible sanction, they also, and as plainly, ordain that, by APOSTOLIC TEACHING, these divinely revealed facts must be still taught and learned. There has been no divine change in this matter. "As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be," is as yet the unreversed decree concerning the mode of teaching divine faith. Is it affirmed that this mode, or the authority of it, has been changed? But by whom? By the Word of God? Has God spoken on the subject of this assumed change? If so, to whom? And when? Nay, verily, his Word has not been heard in the matter. Whatever change can be shown, has been the cunning device of fallible men, and not the decree of the eternal God: it has been had and seen outside of the Mother Church, and not within its walls and before its altars. We have said Jews and pagans ascertained the facts of divine revelation by apostolic teaching, and that this truth appeared upon the face of the commission or divine charter, under which the holy Apostolic Church was organized: we say it is expressed in the very terms of this charter. Now to the proof; the words of the commission are: "All power is

given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, AND TEACH all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to OBSERVE all things whatsoever I HAVE commanded YOU; and, lo, I AM with YOU always, even unto the end of the world. Amen." The first thing which strikes the attention of the devout observer and sincere inquirer after truth, in this divine charter to teach divine faith, is that the holy Church, by the authority conferred in this constitution and act of perfect organization, is endowed with all the elements and the entire nature of her title, namely, the holy Apostolic Catholic Church. She is "holy" because the blessed Redeemer organized her—gave her her constitution to teach "all things whatsoever" he had commanded; that is, the very faith *before* revealed unto its consecrated teaching officers. She was "apostolic" because her officers were consecrated and ordained a perpetual living Order and Character of men—a holy priesthood forever: "I am with YOU until the end of the world." The order, the character, the office,—in one word, the perpetual priesthood,—thus organized by this divine charter, was to live (exist) forever; and so live in union with its divine Consecrator and Head: "Lo,

I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Peter and James, and John and Andrew, and the rest of the men filling the office and discharging the duties pertaining to the order, would die the natural deaths of men; but the order and office of priesthood —the sacerdotal teachers—would live forever. It was the divinely-consecrated order of priesthood with whom Jesus Christ promised to be, when he said, "I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." It was to the *order*, and not to the *personal* of the priesthood, the promise was made. This is self-evident, because the *persons* soon died and soon ceased to teach the nations. But this Church, thus organized, was also "Catholic," —that is, universal,—because it was to teach "all nations" to do and observe "all things whatsoever" which had been revealed to her: she was the holy Catholic Apostolic Church. And the divinely consecrated order—the perpetual priesthood—thus organized and endowed, and so guaranteed (as it was) by the assurances, the repeated promises of Christ, the blessed Saviour, has never faltered in its mission; and never has, for one moment, doubted any one of the promises the divine Founder of the Church gave to her for her hopeful encouragement. This holy priesthood—this

holy Apostolic Catholic Church—now believes every word of the promises the blessed Jesus made to her. Every word. She always has believed it. When Cæsar and his minions and parasites gloated over what they supposed the last drop of her children's blood, and the last breath of the "Nazarene," as Cæsar was sometimes pleased contemptuously to style the blessed Saviour and his Church,—in such deadening trials as these the Church confided as fully and as hopefully in the promises of her divine Founder as she did when states and emperors appealed to her wisdom and justice to decide upon their grievances and to settle their contests. Her faith and that of her children stands not in prosperity nor in adversity—stands not in power nor in suffering, but in the promises of Christ; in "every word which proceedeth out of the mouth of God." "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." "That your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God."

And the devout investigator of truth must not let it escape his observation and the convictions of his conscience, that the holy Apostolic Catholic Church, in its constitution is, at its organization was, the SUCCESSOR of Jesus Christ,

and in its divine order received from him the ministry and the power he had, on earth, from his Father. Note it:—the holy Church, as a divine order, as a perpetual Priesthood, succeeded, on earth, to the divine power and authority the blessed Jesus had from his Father. The ministerial authority and supernatural power he had, on earth, from his Father, he transferred to,—"breathed upon," his Church as his successor, to "do even greater works" than himself. There is no observation which can be made, on the divine scheme and constitutional plan of teaching, organized by the blessed Saviour, that is plainer and of more importance than this. It contains within itself thoughts for volumes of meditations.

The holy Catholic Church succeeded to the ministry and power of Jesus Christ on earth. The commission begins by the announcement, "All power is given unto me in heaven and on earth." And in the twentieth chapter of St. John's gospel we read: "As the Father hath sent me, I also send *you*. When he had said this, he breathed on them, and he said unto them; receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins ye *shall* forgive, they are forgiven them, and whose sins ye *shall* retain they are retained." This is one of the marked instances of the fact, and but one of many, that the Church suc-

ceeded, by divine right and authority, to the ministry and power, on earth, which Jesus Christ had from his Father. Here supernatural power is conferred. An office, an order,—a perpetual Priesthood is created, to teach forever, and divine power is conferred upon the order with the office. And the supernatural power which was thus conferred upon the Church, was not *limited in time*, but limited only *to the order* of divinely consecrated teachers. Will the accusers of the Church, who so bitterly sneer at her claims to divine power and authority, forgive her and her children for their faith, when we assure them that we believe every word of the promises of the ever-blessed Redeemer, who organized her and gave her the power he had from his Father, and power even to do greater miracles than he did?

The Church believes and teaches her children that they must believe every word of the living God, who organized his Church and *endowed*, *endowed*, *endowed* it with its spiritual nature and functions, without any element of which it ceases to be his, would die, and so forfeit every word of his promises and every assurance of his truth, which the blessed Jesus gave to her for her life. The order, the office, the holy Priesthood, is to live forever, and live with its

spiritual nature and functions, with Jesus; and is to have with her the abiding power of the Holy Spirit, "all days, even unto the end of the world." In legal terminology, the Church which was at first called or selected, was now created a spiritual corporation and endowed, in the act of creation, as an element of its nature, with divine miraculous power. This spiritual corporation, by or through its college of officers, was to live forever, enjoying its own original nature and power:—its nature, functions, and authority were to abide in it until the end of the world: "I will send you another comforter, and he shall abide with you forever." The Father sent the blessed Jesus into the world to create, to organize, and institute the Church: to constitute it in its divine order and character, a perpetual Priesthood. And the divine Son sent the Apostles "into all the world," with the same supernatural authority and perpetual power which he had from his Father. Their consecrated successors and they are one: "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. If all the *persons* of the *order* did not constitute the Church, the promise would fail. It is one order, one Church, one Priesthood, having one God, one faith, one baptism; and this lives forever, and Christ lives with it, and the Holy Ghost abides in it

always. If this were not so, the promise to be with "you," the Church, and the promise that the Holy Ghost when he cometh shall abide in you, the perpetual Priesthood—the sacerdotal order, would have been false promises. And, independent of the spiritual nature and constitution of the Church, without an element of which it cannot live; and independent of the reason and necessity of the case, combined with the promises of Christ, that the authority and power of the primitive Church should remain in it, when its original members would die; and independent of the many other instances of its exercise, in the lifetime of the original Apostles; there is one example so marked in time, and so exact in occasion and circumstances, that it is peculiarly proper to refer to it here. It will be found in the first chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, and from the 15th to the 26th verses, inclusive. This occasion was when a successor to Judas Iscariot was ordained to the Apostleship, "To be a witness with us of his resurrection." Immediately after this, on the day of Pentecost, we find the eleven Apostles, and the successor to the other, all together, with one accord in one place; and the Holy Spirit which had been promised them, to be sent to abide with them forever, came upon them. And then they

instantly began to execute the duties of their offices, to which they were ordained in the order of the perpetual Priesthood. They began the ministry of teaching. Then, when the last element of the spiritual nature of the Church was added to her previous endowments and constitutional capacities, she began to teach the nations. And the faith she then taught, and the ministrations she then established, must be taught and ministered forever; that is, unto the end of the world. Apostolic teaching—the faith the Apostles taught, must be taught to the exclusion of every other; for God commanded this to be taught, and he cursed every other form of teaching, as a forgery, and therefore an idolatry. "But though we or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." Galatians, chap. i., ver. 8–9. "If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed; for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds." 2d Epistle of John.

Hence, it is not an immaterial thing, as the

sects assume, whether we teach, believe, and practise the faith the Apostles taught or not. It is certainly not an immaterial thing to preach any other; for the Apostle, in the execution of his great office, and in the fulfilment of his commission, pronounces such preacher accursed, though he were an angel from heaven who assumed the office, without teaching the divine faith revealed. This divine office, in the holy order of the priesthood, cannot be filled by one who is not consecrated to teach, and who does not teach apostolic faith—the very faith which the primitive Apostles taught. All other teaching of revelation is without any authority from God; and the teachers of such other revelation are profoundly anathematized, and they cannot relieve themselves from the judgment of God upon their offence, by an allegation of the immateriality of their teaching. If immaterial and non-essential in its difference from the divine faith of the Apostles, why teach it? Why teach it? Why teach it? All other teaching of faith than that divine faith the Apostles taught, is an insult to God's grace, a forgery upon his truth, and a rebellion against his government, and an act of usurpation in exercising his authority, that cannot be characterized.

We will bring this essay to a close in the lan-

guage of our most gifted countryman* upon the constitution and organized character of the Church. He says: "But the Catholic Church, as a body or corporation, the only sense in which it is alleged to have any teaching faculty at all, is not an aggregation of individuals who at any time compose it—a body born and dying with them, but the contemporary of our Lord and his Apostles, in immediate communion with them, and thus annihilating all distance of time and place between them and us. She is, in the sense supposed, a corporation, and, like every corporation, a collective individual possessing the attribute of immortality. She knows no interruption, no succession of moments, no lapse of years. Like the eternal God, who is ever with her, and whose organ she is, she has duration, but no succession. She can never grow old, never fall into the past. The individuals who compose her body may change, but she changes not; one by one they may pass off, and one by one be renewed, while she continues ever the same; as in our own bodies, old particles constantly escape, and new ones are assimilated, so that the whole matter of which they are composed is changed once in every six or

* See Brownson's Essays, pp. 122, 123.

seven years, and yet they remain always identically the same bodies. These changes as to the individual, change nothing as to the body. The Church to-day is identically that very body which saw our Lord when he tabernacled the flesh. She who is our dear Mother, and on whose words we hang with so much delight, beheld with her own eyes the stupendous miracles which were performed in Judea eighteen hundred years ago; she assisted at the preaching of the Apostles on the day of Pentecost, when the Holy Ghost descended upon them in cloven tongues of fire; she heard St. Peter, the prince of the Apostles, relate how the Spirit descended upon Cornelius and his household, and declare how God had chosen that by his mouth the Gentiles should hear the Word of God and believe; she listened with charmed ear and ravished heart to the last admonition of "the disciple whom Jesus loved:"—"My dear children, love one another;" she saw the old temple razed to the ground, the legal rights of the old covenant abolished, and the once chosen people driven out from the Holy Land, and scattered over the earth; she beheld pagan Rome, in the pride and pomp of power, bled under her persecuting emperors, and finally planted the cross in triumph on her ruins. She has been

the contemporary of eighteen hundred years, which she has arrested in their flight and made present to us, and will make present to all generations as they rise. With one hand she receives the *depositum* of faith from the Lord and his commissioned Apostles; with the other she imparts it to us."

"What has this body to do, in order to decide what books are, and what are not, inspired? Merely to declare a simple fact which she has received on competent authority —merely what our Lord or his Apostles have told her. What needs she, to do it with infallible certainty? Simply protection against forgetting, misunderstanding, and mistating; and this she has, because she has our Lord always abiding with her, and the Paraclete, who leads her into all truth, and 'brings to her remembrance' all the words spoken to her by our Lord himself personally, or by his inspired Apostles,—keeping her memory always fresh, rendering her infallible assistance rightly to understand and accurately to express what she remembers to have been taught."

Appendix.

The Divine Office of the Church.

INTRODUCTION.

In the preceding Essay no direct argument has been made to prove the specific dogmas of the Church. When any of these has been established it has been incidental to the main purpose. Since the completion of the Essay, however, it has been thought advisable briefly to investigate the divine office of the Church. In the execution of this *office* she claims to be infallible. And as her infallibility is, at all times, impugned by declamatory and even violent denunciation, the necessity and reason of this claim, and its manifest foundation in the Word of God, is the subject of the two brief chapters now appended to the Essay. In their careful perusal the candid reader, who admits and realizes the truths of divine revelation, as recorded in the *written* Word, will find that the Church, so far from arrogating to herself an impossible and absurd power, bases her claim upon the purest teachings of reason as well as the sublime and positive truths of rev-

elation. She claims to be infallible in the execution of her divine office. This office is teaching divine faith or revelation to all the world for all time; and so teaching it as not to change or corrupt the truths which she was organized and commanded to teach. She claims she can execute, and does execute, this office faithfully, without adulterating any of the revealed truth. And the foundation and reality of this claim, in reason and revelation, is the question which is discussed in the following chapters, with such precision and distinctness, it is hoped, that if they be not instructive, they will not be tedious.

THE AUTHOR.

THE DIVINE OFFICE OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

The Infallibility of the Church, in her Office of Teaching Divine Revelation, examined.

The infallibility of the Holy, Apostolic, and Catholic Church, in her office of teaching divine faith or revelation, is the rock upon which rests the faith of all her children and the hope of the world. Those who accuse her doctrinal teaching, because she claims to be infallible, and affirms that she never has adulterated the divine truths she was commanded to teach forever, are literally blind as to the nature of their accusation. These accusers do not perceive the logical and actual horrors necessarily contained in their arguments for the Church's fallibility. They do not know that their accusation and arraignment involve an assumption of a *fact* which is at once a dethronement of God and a contradiction of his divine word. To deny infallibility to the teaching of divine faith, by her, in the execu-

tion of her office, is surely no ordinary assertion, as we shall see in the investigation of its character. Both in its *nature* and consequences, the denial is fearfully portentous. In its nature, because it is equivalent to an assertion that God commanded a system of truths, to be taught to all the world forever, which he knew would not and could not be taught; but that some error or errors of human opinion would be taught instead of the divine faith which he commanded. In its *consequences* (man alone considered), because if the Church be not infallible, when executing her office, the human family can never know whether what is taught be false or true. How is it possible for it to ascertain the truth, unless it be taught with infallible certainty? The preacher who appears before men to teach them divine faith, and yet cannot assure them that what he teaches is divine revelation, and not human opinion, assumes a position at once daringly and ignobly wicked. He announces himself an ambassador from God to teach his divine word; and, in the very breath and act of such annunciation, affirms that he has no assurance whether he teaches truth or falsehood. He may give his *opinion* with perfect sincerity; but when he is asked if he can assure the children of his

instruction, that what he teaches is the very truth the Saviour revealed to the Apostles, and which they taught to their disciples, he is at fault—he cannot affirm whether it is so or not; that is, whether his teaching be true or false. Surely this is a frightful position for poor mortal man to occupy. And no other can any teacher of divine faith occupy who cannot, under the gaze of the Omnipotent God, assure those whom he teaches that his teachings are infallibly true; that is, that they are the very truths which the blessed Jesus *had* revealed to his Church *before* he gave the Apostles the divine commission to teach all nations. The accusers of the Church, however, have very vague, and even wild and absurd notions as to her infallibility. They are, generally, in profound error as to the nature and elements of her securities against false teaching. The three hundred years during which they have been in bondage to heresy, have so obliterated from their minds the traditions of their fathers, which they observed before they went into captivity, that now they do not know in what the infallibility of the Church consists. They are, in the main, wholly mistaken as to the nature and character of this immunity from error which the Church possesses.

Hence, for their sakes, it is necessary to correct their false ideas, and to distinguish them from the truth which the Church teaches concerning her infallibility. In what, then, consists the Church's infallibility? It does not consist in the impeccability (sinlessness) of priests, bishops, and the supreme pontiff, for these are sinful men, "with like passions" with their spiritual children. The pope has his confessor, and so have bishops and priests. But, if sinful men, how can they teach divine faith infallibly? and why may not heretical preachers so teach as well as they? Heretical preachers cannot teach divine faith infallibly, because they do not pretend they can do so; secondly, because they have no standard of truth which they agree to as teaching "one God, one faith, one baptism;" thirdly, because divine faith was not revealed to them; fourthly, because they have no commission; fifthly, because they have no promises that they will be protected from error, any more than they have *pretences* that they are, in fact, free from it in their several teachings. But the Church claims, and always has claimed, that she teaches divine faith infallibly. And how is it that her priesthood can do so? They are sinful men, it is conceded; how then can these sinners teach the divine truths revealed to the

Church by our blessed Saviour, without any adulteration or mixture of falsehood? The priesthood or sacerdotal order is an order of officers. AN ORDER OF OFFICERS. They are the teaching order, and were constituted to teach divine faith to "all nations, even unto the consummation of the world;" that is, to all nations for all time. The sacerdotal order then execute an office. THEY EXECUTE AN OFFICE. And the question is, can they execute it as instructed and commanded by their divine Master, or not? In the solution of this question is involved the *fact* of the infallibility of the Church's teaching. Can the officers execute the duties of the office? Can they do it and be sinful men, who confess their sins to one another, in obedience to one of the duties imposed upon them by their office?

There is no reason, in the nature of things (apart from their divine constitution), why they cannot. Despoil the sacerdotal order of the continual protection of the Holy Ghost, and yet there would seem, in the analogies of nature and the institutions of men, some assurances for the ability of the Church to execute her commission; some security that she would fulfil the divine command imposed upon her at her institution. But, with the perpetual communion and presence of the blessed Jesus

and the Holy Ghost, her securities are undoubted, because they are just such as her divine Founder deemed necessary to her sufficiency in teaching truth instead of error. Among natural things, we observe nothing which corrupts its primary nature and departs (of itself) from the original constitution impressed upon it by its Creator. In the affairs of men, the same thing (integrity to constitution) is not only possible, but probable and common. A judge of our courts may, personally, be immoral—may be profane and lie, for instance; and he may, and generally does, execute the duties of his office with unflinching adherence to the constitution of the state. So may senators, sheriffs, and clerks. These may all violate the moral law, and yet, with rigorous exactitude and with unaccused rectitude, execute the duties of their offices in accordance with the constitution and laws of the civil state, and to the entire satisfaction of the people. Hence it is seen how men may be naturally sinners and officially righteous. And it is also seen that among natural things nothing, of itself, departs from the constitution which God stamps upon it, in its order. But it is especially to be remarked, that in the affairs of men, under any political constitution, there is not the *slightest necessity* for them,

though morally sinful, to be officially corrupt: that official integrity is perfectly compatible with personal immorality. God has, as mercifully as wisely, made them entirely consistent, else official corruption would universally disgrace every institution of man, just as universal error would disgrace and blight all the teachings of the Christian religion, if the Church were not infallible. Let every soul of earth thank God that he has made personal immorality consistent with official integrity in the affairs of men. Is it consistent with his mercy, and our reason, to believe that he has acted with less wisdom and less mercy in the constitution of his Church?

And, finally, it is demonstrated to the most obtuse intellect how it is, that while the sacerdotal order is constituted of sinful men, they are infallible in the execution of their office, which is the teaching the facts of divine revelation truly and not falsely, purely and not corruptly.

And it is to be remembered that the demonstration, thus far, is made on natural and political principles with which every man is familiar.

But the Church invokes higher and more certain principles than these, to assure the world of the infallibility of her teaching.

She has a divine constitution. She is divinely endowed. Her being is in the spiritual order. In the spiritual order it would seem, then, that she could no more depart, of herself, from the principles of her organization, than a rock would, of itself, depart from the principles of its organization in the natural order. God constitutes both, each in its order. He constitutes each for a purpose, in its place. And there can be no reason imagined why one will corrupt its own nature more than the other. If there be, there is vastly more certainty in the Church remaining incorrupt and true to her constitution, in her order, than the rock in its order; for she is intelligent, and has a command imposed on her to teach other intelligences unchanging truth; and upon the reception of and obedience to her teaching of this eternal truth, the happiness of all other moral intelligences on earth is made to depend. So that the Church must be more true to the principles of her constitution in the spiritual order, than the rock is in the natural, if either can frustrate the intent and decrees of the eternal God, in the uses for which they were organized.

But has the Church a divine commission or constitution by which she is organized as the authoritative spiritual teacher of the world?

Has she authority, by divine institution, to teach revealed faith to all nations? If she has, it is now beyond dispute that she can execute HER OFFICE, though the sacerdotal order be sinful men. Has she the commission and authority, and are these divine?

Undoubtedly she has; and here it is, as recorded by St. Matthew, eight years after it was sealed. I quote it from the Protestant version: "Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw him, they worshipped him; but some doubted. And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, *even* unto the end of the world. Amen."

The first question which presents itself on the face of this divine authority and constitution is, what was the Church commanded to teach? To teach and *observe* all things he *had*, before that time, commanded the teaching order. No more, no less. He *had* before that revealed to them certain truths, and had set before them certain observances, and upon

these, whatever they were, depended the eternal happiness of the human race. Upon these *very* truths, in their fulness and exactitude, depended the salvation of mankind. (Mark xvi. 16.) Hence the very moment the Church failed to teach them exactly as revealed to the sacerdotal order, that moment she became fallible, and in the same instant the world was lost, the mission and teaching and blood of Jesus Christ was a failure, and teaching error instead of divine truth was henceforth the office of the Church. Are these pregnant and terrible doctrines admissible interpolations upon the divine commission? Let the accusers of the Church consider the question. It is a self-evident teaching of reason itself that the Church, when she was thus divinely instituted, organized, and commissioned, thus fresh and new born in the endowments of her Creator, was an infallible teacher, whom the whole world was bound to believe and to implicitly obey. But the world was to believe and obey forever, for so long was the Church commanded to teach the very truths revealed. We let this pass, however. At the moment then of her organization, the Church was infallible. Her constitution was divine; her mission was divine; her teaching was the immediate revelation of Divinity. All this is beyond question.

Thus far we have an infallible Church. And her *office* and single duty was to teach the *exact* truth which had been revealed to her sacerdotal order by her divine Founder.

Now, could she lose her divine constitution and authority? This is a grave question. If she could, and did, then her accusers are right in disobeying her authority by discrediting her teaching; but they are manifestly wrong in teaching any other thing than those things which she taught and observed *before* she changed her divine constitution, and frustrated the design of her divine Founder in her organization. This is too manifest for discussion. If she has *changed* her divine constitution—that is, if she has corrupted the teaching of the divine facts revealed to her for some other things which were not revealed, then, of course, whoever so asserts can point to the time and place when and where this change of falsehood for revealed truth took place; they can specify the very truth or truths she changed into a lie; they can tell us by whom this was done. But this has never been done, and never will be. Yet the Church does not place her infallibility upon a question between the general declamation of her accusers and their inability to put specific facts in issue. She stands upon a much surer foundation

than the defects in the assertions and logic of her accusers. She stands clothed in the vestments of truth, in which Almighty God arrayed her when he endowed her; she stands mailed in the armor of his unfailing promises, and fortified by the presence of the blessed Jesus and the Holy Ghost. She says and teaches that she was infallible, has always been infallible, and always will be infallible, in the execution of her office, which is teaching divinely revealed faith to the world. She affirms this on the precise and definite promises of God. If she makes good the declaration that she affirms her infallibility on the "precise and definite promises of God," then whoever affirms her fallibility disputes the promises of God. This is a clear position, and one full of eternal consequences. It is a fact, then, or it is not a fact, that the Church can affirm her unfailing infallibility on distinct and unambiguous promises of God; and that, if she can, whoever denies her affirmation, contradicts Almighty God.

Has the Church, then, the promise of God that she shall be forever free from error in the execution of her office of teaching divine faith? She has such promises—always has had. They are specific and definite. The first one that ought to challenge the attention and

arrest the profound consideration of her accusers, is contained in the commission itself. It follows the command to execute the duties of the office into which the sacerdotal order was then installed. It is in these words: "And lo, I am with you alway, *even* unto the end of the world. Amen." The blessed Jesus himself is with the teaching order. *With them!* With the sacerdotal or teaching order, always. Always! Yes, even unto the end of the world. He gave his promise to be with his Church always; he was with her then, and he promised to be so forever. This promise is a part of her divine constitution, and one of its miraculous elements; so miraculous that her adversaries deny it—dispute the word of God contained in a glorious and consoling promise. They deny it. The issue being such, who is to be believed: the Church, standing on the word of promise; or her accusers, who deny the sacredness of its truth? "The real presence of Christ" in the Church is a miraculous fact, or he never revealed a truth to the sacerdotal order, and never commanded them to teach any revealed truth to the world forever. His real presence, then, is one security against error in the execution of her divine office, and one of infinite sufficiency. In St. John's Gospel, xvii. 22, this delegation of divine power to the

Church is thus described: "And the glory which thou hast given me, I have given to them, that they may be one, as we also are one." "And I have made known thy name to them, and will make it known; that the love wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them, and I in them." "I have given them thy word." "I do not ask that thou take them out of the world, but that thou preserve them from evil." "They are not of the world, as I am not of the world." "As thou hast sent me into the world, I also send them into the world, and for them I do sanctify myself, that they may be sanctified in truth." "Thy word is truth." (John xvii.)

Whoever will casually look into the written word (the only authority with the Church's accusers), will find very many evidences of Christ's unity and residence with his Church.

But there are also many distinct promises that another person of the Holy Trinity, namely, the Holy Ghost, shall be received into and reside with the Church organized by the blessed Saviour. Some of these are: "I have many things to say to you; but you cannot bear them now. But when the Spirit of truth shall come, he will teach you all truth; for he shall not speak of himself; but what things soever he shall hear, he shall speak; and the things that

are to come, he will show you. He shall glorify me; because he shall receive of me, and will declare it unto you." (John xvi.) "But when the Paraclete shall come, whom I will send you from the Father, the Spirit of truth, who proceedeth from the Father, he shall give testimony of me. And you shall give testimony, because you are with me from the beginning." (John xv.) "These things I have spoken to you, remaining with you. But when the Paraclete, the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things, *and bring all things to your mind*, whatsoever I shall have said to you. And I will ask the Father, and he shall send you another Paraclete, that he may *abide with you forever*. The Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive; because it seeth him not, nor knoweth him; but you shall know him; because he shall abide with you, and shall be in you." (John xiv.)

These promises are very definite. No language can be more explicit than these declarations, which are *statements* assuring the Church that Jesus Christ organized the gift, residence, and office of the Holy Ghost in her body. "The Church is the body of Christ." The three important, consoling, and unerring facts contained in these statements, made in

the form of a promise, are the gift, the residence, and the office of the Holy Ghost, to be with the sacerdotal order, in the execution of their office forever. To whom were these promises made? Who was endowed, in their fulfilment, with their efficacy, power, use, and authority? Assuredly, the sacerdotal order, in Christ's Church—the very Church he organized. The teaching order, the priesthood, of that very Church which the Saviour organized to teach the faith he had revealed to this Church to teach and observe *forever*. To no other order was the revelation of the faith, to be taught, made; to no other was the promise made. To this order, alone, did he give the assurance, that "whosoever heareth you heareth me;" and to no other did he give a command to teach, with the assurance that "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be condemned." (Mark xvi. 16.) Hence the necessity of the gift, residence, and office of the Holy Ghost. The eternal consequences which were linked to her teaching, demanded the infallibility of the Church, in the execution of her divine office. Belief in her teaching secures eternal life; disbelief is visited with eternal condemnation. If the Church does not teach the very truth revealed to her, neither

consequence can follow. The human family cannot be saved by believing a teaching which is not the revealed truth, nor condemned for disbelieving falsehoods which may be taught in its stead. This is so self-evident, that reason itself must rise and affirm, that either God never organized a Church, with the securities against error on which Jesus Christ alleged he founded her forever; or that she has not, and cannot, in the administration of her office, *change* the facts on which the salvation of the human race depends. This, in the conscience of reason (so to speak), secures the world against indifferent errors and indifferent truths, as the Church's accusers are pleased to style them; for either no indifferent truths were revealed, or, by the fact of their revelation, and the fact that they were commanded to be taught and obeyed, under such fearful consequences, they became divinely material truths. But the idea that Christ revealed indifferent or immaterial truths—that is, truths which it made no difference whether they were taught, and if taught, whether they were believed or not, is surely a blasphemy. Certainly no imputation can be made more dishonoring to God than that he should reveal, for the *instruction* of mankind, either immaterial truths or immaterial errors (and the differ-

ence is not very apparent), and command them to be taught to the world, with a promise of life to those who believed them, and a threat of death to those who believed them not. The fool, in his drunken revels, would hardly act in so reckless a manner. The promises, then, were made to the sacerdotal order. For what? For what purpose was the gift and office of the Holy Ghost? The gift and office are, of course, inseparable. What then is the office of the Holy Ghost in the Church? The functions of this office are surely not useless—not immaterial. That the Holy Ghost resides or abides in the Church "forever" is true, or the words of Christ are untrue. If he does not reside in that same Church which Christ established, then his promise has become a false assurance, and there is no Christian Church founded on revealed truth, and teaching it forever. And if he resides in the same Church the Saviour established, then he executes *an office* in that Church, though "the world seeth him not" in the discharge of its functions. The Holy Ghost does execute an office in the Church which Jesus Christ established, or else his promise is untrue. His office, thus residing, is twofold —has two grand characteristics or functions: First, to teach and guide her into all truth; secondly, to bring to her mind or remembrance

"all things whatsoever" the blessed Jesus had revealed to her before he gave her her authority. These things, whatever they were, are exactly what he commanded her to teach forever. And these same things the Holy Ghost is forever to bring to her mind while she is administering the duties of her own office. She is thus not only guided into "all truth," but she has her guide as a remembrance to remind her, on all proper occasions, of the "all things whatsoever" that were revealed to her by the Lord Jesus Christ. Is she not a glorious institution? Can she err in the execution of her divine office? We must discredit the divine word before we can so believe. For these facts establish, beyond question, to any mind which *realizes* the truth of divine revelation, even in the written Word, that the Church which Jesus Christ organized is as infallible to-day in the execution of her office of teaching divine faith, or revelation, as she was on the day he gave her her commission and authority. If we credit divine revelation, reason can give us no higher assurance of any truth than she does of this: that the Church which he constituted to teach divine revelation, is as infallible now as it was when he endowed her, and then instantly ascended to his Father. His Word and promises have

failed if this be not so. His mission is more than a failure; it is an entire fabrication, having no foundation in fact, if this be not unqualifiedly true. There is no escape from the dilemma, no evasions or subterfuges will avail; it must be admitted that his Church is as infallible a teacher, that she executes the duties of her office as unerringly now, as she was and did on the day of his ascension; or else his whole life is an imposture, and his entire teaching a fabrication. Such precision in statements, and such definiteness in promises, are exactly true, or they are utterly false when uttered by a teacher, assuming to be divine. The accusers of the Church must take one position or the other. They cannot, they must not, say that the promises were made, but that the Church has corrupted the revealed facts she was constituted to teach *forever*. For, in so doing, they as directly contradict his words and promises, as much dishonor him as they would if they plainly denounced him as a false teacher. He is a false teacher if his Church has, in fact, changed or corrupted the truths he organized her to teach. It must be granted, then, that the Church the blessed Jesus organized, is as infallible a teacher to-day as she was on the day of her organization.

But no other Church, now existing, then

existed, except the Holy Catholic Apostolic Church; no other even claims to reach back, in time, to the day of Christ's ascension. None other. Hence she must be the infallible Church of that day and of this. This patent fact, namely, that the Church which Jesus Christ constituted, is, necessarily, infallible (and, therefore, if any Church now existing be infallible, it must be the same that he endowed), is what compels the Reformed churches (so called) to deny infallibility to any church. They are fifteen hundred years too late in the world to be the SAME CHURCH which he breathed upon, and commissioned to exercise his miraculous authority on earth. Being so, they declaim against infallible authority belonging to any church. They denounce such claim as arrogant and absurd. But from the clear statements of Jesus Christ, they only declaim against his Word, while they are denouncing his Church. It is folly and madness to clamor against her endowments so long as they are the simple expression and fulfilment of his promises. Hence, fact, candor, and logic, all require them to cease to pretend to any faith in his Word, while they continue to defame his Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, by denying her infallible authority IN THE EXECUTION OF HER DIVINE OFFICE, which is

the *office* of teaching the very faith he revealed, and commanded her to teach to all nations, even unto the consummation of the world.

CHAPTER II.

THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH IN HER OFFICE OF TEACHING DIVINE REVELATION. OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED. THE CHURCH IS HER OWN WITNESS. "THE VICIOUS CIRCLE," A MISSTATEMENT OF THE QUESTION. IT IS FIRST, SINISTER; SECONDLY, ABSURD; THIRDLY, NECESSARILY UNTRUE. IT IS UNREASONABLE AND INCREDIBLE.

INASMUCH as the Church rests her claim to infallibility, in her office of teaching divine faith, upon the promises of Christ, her divine Founder, it would seem when she vindicates her claim by these promises, that then no objection could possibly be made against her immunity from error by any who pretend to believe in a revealed religion. To such it would seem that the word and promises of God ought to be supreme authority, against which the shafts of malignity itself would bow in subdued, if not in humble, acquiescence; and that the perversions of human ingenuity would not dare to rise in contest with the clear state-

ments and testimonies of the Eternal God. But such has not been the case. Error, in its unconsciousness of delusion, or in wilful opposition to divine teaching, has even questioned the *sufficiency* of the divine statements to assure the world that his Church can and must execute her office without error in its execution. Error maintains that his promises are not reliable testimonies, and such as the world can trust for the claim that the Holy, Apostolic Church, organized and endowed by the blessed Jesus, teaches the very truth he revealed to her, instead of falsehoods which he did not nor could reveal, and command to be taught. The most delusive of all the sophisms by which this terrible conclusion is reached,is that which the accusers of the Church have styled "the vicious circle," and not inaptly, as we shall see. This is considered a model of artistic skill by the Church's accusers; and they have wielded it with great self-delusive power on the battle-field of Christian polemics, and to the destruction of millions of souls who were guided to their final end, more, however, by the canons of prejudice than the canons of logic. This model of self-delusion is phrased by Dr. Watts in these terms:—"A vicious circle is when two propositions, equally uncertain, are used to prove each other. Thus the

papists prove the authority of the Scriptures by the infallibility of their Church, and they prove the infallibility of their Church from the authority of the Scriptures."

The only objection to this statement, as it stands, is that it is sinister, absurd, and untrue. That it is sinister, will be seen by and by. That it is absurd, is evident, when we consider the force of the term "infallible," as applied to divine teaching. We have seen that "infallibility," in this use of that term, means, that the Church, in the execution of office, can and does execute the office free from any official corruption; that she teaches the truths of divine revelation exactly as they were revealed to her, when she was commanded to teach them, forever. Hence the proposition is absurd, because whenever the Church establishes any revealed fact by her infallibility, the infallibility is a witness, of course, to all the faith revealed to her by her divine Master, which he constituted her to teach. She needs no other witness; for if her teaching be infallible, then whatever faith she instructs her children to receive and practise must be the very truth which was revealed to her. Her divine constitution or organization is her own witness, and she can have no other. The statement is, of necessity, untrue, when we

consider the necessary order of the two *facts;* namely, the divine constitution of the Church and the composition and publication of the sacred writings. Their relation to each other, in the order of time, and the successive periods of time in which the Scriptures themselves were written, stamp the objectionable statement as a very remarkable misconception, or wilful perversion of the real state of the case. The argument "from the Scriptures," by Catholics to the accusers of the Church, is simply an argument *ad hominem.*

As *such*, it cannot be evaded, either by unskilful mistakes or criminal perversions. Its force, as such, is stunning, unanswerable, and overwhelming. Now, what is the real state of the case, *the fact*, based on this argument? It is this: the Church, in obedience to the divine command enjoined on her at her institution, comes with the infallible authority of her organization—with the indorsements her divine Master conferred on her at his ascension, to "teach all nations." This was eight years before the first gospel was written, and sixty-three years before the gospel of St. John and the Apocalypse were written. But of this directly. The Church comes with her divine constitution, and hence infallible authority, to "teach all nations, even unto the consumma-

tion of the world." This divine constitution is her birth, her power, her existence or being, from which her successive miracles in all ages flow. Her trophies, in the conversion of nations, follow from her constitution, an element of which is miraculous capacity. (1 Cor. xii. 10.) And this element cannot be lost without her ceasing to be what her God created her, namely, an infallible teacher. Her constitution, her organization, her endowments, are gifts fresh from the hand of God, freely bestowed upon her by his divine revelation, will, pleasure, and grace; and are *facts*, and not the creations of logical propositions, whether these can stand the tests of the science, or whether its canons can elicit their viciousness and expose their fallaciousness or not.

But when the Church in her progress, *in the order of time*, of teaching all nations, in obedience to her revealed charter and its behests, comes with her divine constitution, by which she was divinely organized an infallible teacher, "even unto the consummation of the world," she is met in her divine pathway (fifteen hundred years after her organization) by heretics, who interpose a protest against her mission, in the execution of the divine command and obligations imposed upon her by her nature and office. And they say to her: "You are neither

infallible nor credible, because you bear witness to yourself." And just here, at this exact point, the Church presents to her accusers the argument *ad hominem*. She says to them: "Very well. Here are twenty-eight small tracts, comprised in four Gospels, one of Acts, twenty-two Epistles, and a Prophetic Vision, which were WRITTEN BY MY CHILDREN, under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, concerning my origin, my character, and my divine mission, and giving an account of *some* of my acts and miracles, in *some* of the nations taught by me in the first century of my existence. These tracts, which are the New Testament, you believe to be inspired and infallible truth; so do I; and 'they are they which testify of me.' These tracts *you* allow to be credible witnesses, and I allow them to be such. I agree that they are true, and know they are; for, in virtue of my infallible authority, the Holy Ghost guiding me into all truth, I have pronounced upon them and decided them true, and have preserved them free from human corruptions for all generations of men, as undoubted and infallible truth. *You* agree (I know upon what evidence) that they are divine and revealed truth. To them, then, we will appeal as a common standard of truth, in whose *statements* we both assure the world we

confide, and submit to their decision the judgment of my infallibility. By these tracts alone I will submit to be tried, for the purposes of our controversy. I will waive, in this instance, my own testimony, by means of which I originally and always converted the heathen, and by which my divine constitution and endowments authorize me to be adjudged, and will submit to the tribunal selected by you, and known to me as one of infallible truth when its decisions are understood and correctly interpreted. A false interpretation of divine truth, of course, is no evidence in the case. The *mind of God* in the written Word, and not a *human opinion* concerning that Word, is the matter to be ascertained in the investigation and decision." This is the way, in this precise manner, does the Church appeal to the Scriptures to vindicate her infallibility, against the protest of her accusers. It is thus she makes to them the argument *ad hominem*. In other and a few words, all this may be stated thus: The Church submits, upon the protest against her authority, to a tribunal selected by heretics, to an authority which they recognize as infallible. And when the decision is rendered against them on the appeal, they, with the utmost simplicity, turn upon her and say: "Ah, the judgment of this infal-

lible tribunal, to which we have by common consent referred this contest, is of no account, no force or validity; for you papists prove your authority to teach all nations by the infallibility of your Church, and you prove the infallibility of your Church by the Scriptures. That's false logic; that's the 'vicious circle.'" This is the real state of the case, so far as the logical fallacy of the "vicious circle" is concerned; and this is a fair sample of the organic or rather chronic acuteness of Protestant controvertists in the art of logic. Their position does not reach the dignity of a logical fallacy, growing out of the insequence of their propositions. It is a bald misstatement of the case; a misrepresentation of the facts as they are, to cover a conviction before a tribunal of their own selection for the trial of their cause.

I have said that the position of Protestants is one which destroys the *necessary order* of the two facts; namely, the divine constitution and organization of the Church, and the writing of the New Testament Scriptures. It is a necessity, in the nature of things, that the Church must have been divinely constituted, and endowed with her attributes, her life and functions, her faith and missions, her divine office and authority in virtue of it, before any

written account could be made of the fact. This is self-evident, necessarily so; hence the conclusive nature of the Church's own testimony as to her divine institution, and its superiority over any subsequently written account of it, if either the Church or the sacred Scriptures had to yield to the other. But, blessed be God, the Catholic is put to no such horrible alternative. But wherefore the sinister insinuation which quails and cannot look you in the eye, as you fasten your gaze upon its insidious position in the allegation against the Church? I mean the qualifying terms, "equally uncertain;" "a vicious circle is when two propositions, equally uncertain, are used to prove each other."

The divine organization and endowments of the Church and the infallible truth of the Scriptures, are not "equally uncertain" to "Papists;" but they are two facts, alike secure and infallibly certain, and both resting on the eternal and unchanging truth of Almighty God. Are they equally uncertain to Protestants? If so, they deny both; for they unquestionably deny the infallibility of the Church. This covert assertion, shrinking back, as it were, to screen itself from the penetrating and manly eye of truth, manifestly was intended to steal a significance of some sort.

And, as it has no sort of applicability to the sentiments and faith of the Church, its genuine idea, when dragged from its ensconcement, must be a strong unuttered opinion, that neither the Church nor the sacred Scriptures rest with infallible certainty on divine authority. Doubtless dubitance on this subject was the actual sentiment of the adroit logician, however unawakened into a distinct recognition and full consciousness, the doubt may have been sleeping in his soul.

Now, let us see when the tracts comprised in the New Testament were written. St. Matthew's gospel was written A. D., 41; St. Mark, 43; St. Luke, 57; St. John's gospel, 96. The Acts were written A. D., 63, or later, for it brings up the transactions to that time; Romans, 60; 1 Corinthians, 59; 2 Corinthians, 60; Gallatians, 58; Ephesians, 64; Philippians, 64; Colossians, 64; 1 Thessalonians, 54; 2 Thessalonians, 54; 1 Timothy, 65; 2 Timothy, 65; Philemon, 64; Titus, 65; Hebrews, 64; 1 Peter, 60; 2 Peter, 66; 1 John, 90; 2 John, 90; 3 John, 90; St. Jude, 66; Revelation, 96. Thus it is manifest that the Church was divinely constituted and organized to teach all nations, and bore her testimony to the fact, for eight years before the first tract of the New Testament was written, and for sixty-

three years before the gospel of St. John and the Revelation, were written. Upon what grounds could Protestants rest an argument for their opinions before the New Testament was begun, or before it was completed? This is a question as difficult to evade by the faulty logic of a misstatement, as that which the "vicious circle" seeks to elude. They must hold that for eight or sixty-three years—according as they rely on the first tract, or the completion of all, for their evidence—that the Church has no evidence upon which to convince the world of her divine origin and authority. For this period she was a teacher without any authority to teach. Such is their inevitable position, and the "vicious circle" cannot hide it from ordinary scrutiny. And upon what did the holy Church rest her authority in these years, in which there was no New Testament, to "teach all nations?" Simply upon the divine power communicated to her by her divine Founder. This is the rock upon which she ever rests. Before the tracts comprised in the New Testament were written by the children of the Church, and, of course, before she had stamped upon them the seal of infallible truth,—an infallibility which, however impressed, heretics do not generally deny,—the holy Apostolic Church had borne

testimony to herself, to her divine constitution and authority for many years.

In these years she had taught the faith revealed to her, and had administered her sacraments and consolations to her children, which were among the revealed elements of her spiritual constitution, mission, and office. It was simply thus that she bore witness against the world, and before its paganism, its wrath, and the fierceness of its bloody persecutions to her own infallibility, for its conversion and the consolation of her dear children. It was thus that she affirmed her credibility and maintained her infallibility as a spiritual teacher. Her children then had no Scriptures of divine authority to bear witness to her character, because they had not yet written any, stamped with the impress of her seal, and under the security of her immunity from error. But when, subsequently, they did write them, she, in the exercise of her infallible authority, pronounced upon them, and declared ("defined") them what they were; for she could no more dishonor the truth, when thus revealed, than she could deny or pervert the original authority conferred upon her by her divine Master. Had she refused the seal and impress of her authority to these writings, she had not been infallible; and, in the first age, the Church of

all ages had been destroyed. God's promise to her had failed, which is an impossible thing.

She rests, then, upon her constitution by divine authority and institution for her infallibility, and upon this infallibility, proceeding from divine institution and authority, secured by the residence of the Holy Ghost, for the sacredness and certainty of her teaching. She was constituted by her divine Master an infallible teacher; and hence her teaching is infallible, whether it be in pronouncing upon the inspiration and authority of the Scriptures, or in the ministration of her sacraments, or in the *definition* of what the faithful have always believed concerning the Immaculate Conception. To *define*, for her children, what she has *always* believed, is comparatively an easy exertion of her infallible power.

Why cannot any man or institution define what he or it has always believed? If the Church shall ever come, as doubtless it will, when the devotions of its children shall require it, to define what she has always believed concerning the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, she will do it with the unerring precision wherewith, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, she has always defined (limited the belief in) her articles of faith. But to return. *She was then an infallible teacher before the*

Gospels, Acts, and Epistles were penned; and had borne testimony to the world of the fact. When did she lose this character as a teacher? But no matter, now. When these Scriptures were written by her sainted children, she examined them and pronounced—in virtue of her infallible authority—upon their truth and inspiration. She adjudged them true and inspired. As inspired, she stamped them with authority, so far as their truth extended. So far as their truth extended; but as their truth did not extend, nor assume so to do, to abrogate her divine authority as a teacher of revelation to usurp her divine office, to supplant her divine mission, to repeal the divine power communicated to her constitution; it assuredly follows that any interpretation of these sacred writings which would thus despoil her of her divine attributes, is unquestionably false. Either the Church was not divinely constituted, or the interpretation of the Scriptures, which robs her of any element of the original, divinely delegated power, at first communicated to her, is manifestly false. Let this dilemma be evaded by any art of logic. She teaches that these Scriptures are true and inspired, and upon her infallible authority her testimony is taken as true by all her children. Hence the veracity and authority of the Scrip-

tures in the Church. And, so, not upon two propositions, "equally uncertain." To establish their authority the appeal is to her infallibility. There was no other authority to which to appeal when the Scriptures were written. Mark that. There is none other now. If so, who is he? Where was he born, and when? Where does he reside? When did he begin to exist, and who are the legitimate successors to the original depository of such divine authority.

The Church is the sole and exclusive witness to the infallibility of the Scriptures. The Scriptures, however, are the fundamental rule to Protestants, as they are an infallible one to Catholics; and the Church rightfully, and logically, also, appeals to them as argument *ad hominem* against heretics. Because all truth, on whatever grounds assented to,—whether it be legitimate or illegitimate,—is authority to the extent of its facts and their rightful application, simply because it is true and justly applied. Because there is a power in every revealed, as in every natural fact, when correctly understood and applied, according to its real nature, which must be obeyed. Spiritual power and authority flow from divine revelation. This is the foundation of the Church's infallible authority. The source of her power

is her divine institution, which exists precisely as it was when it was revealed and communicated.

And of course, any subsequent writings, whether stamped with her authority or not,—if interpreted in accordance with the sense of him who gave her constitution,—cannot take from her a single element of the original power with which she was at first endowed by the God who instituted her to teach divine faith and revelation to "all nations." Her constitution, her divine institution, is her infallibility. This is the sum of truth in which her power exists. The art of the logicians cannot well gainsay this conclusion.

But here the Protestants "shift their ground," which is as illogical as their supposed "vicious circle" would be, if it were as true as it is a patent misstatement of the question. But here and now, on their old, as if it were a *new* position, they say again: the Church cannot bear witness to herself and to her own infallibility; and that if she does, her testimony is untrue and incredible. But wherefore incredible, either in the nature of her institution, or in the facts of her history, or in their succession in the order of time? When her divine Founder constituted her his teacher of divine faith, and communicated to her her attributes, is it a

reasonable or probable thing to assert that her teaching would be incredible until he created a witness, other than herself, to vouch for her authority? If so, when the *other* witness—to be so created—came to vouch for her infallibility, then *this* witness would need testimony to its character, and so on *ad infinitum*. This surely is not a reasonable thing. Is it credible that when God was instituting and endowing his Church, he failed to communicate to her that essentially necessary element to the success of her divine mission which would enable her to *convince* the world, that he left her deficient, *without* testimony or evidence to gain credence with individual men and "all nations?" Surely this is an incredible thing.

So much for the reason and credibility of the assertion, tried by the nature of the Church. The facts of her history are equally conclusive against the assertion. These we have already discussed, but they will bear some repetition. Who, then, for sixty-three years before the New Testament was completed, and for eight years before it was began, bore testimony to her authority and spiritual dominion as a teacher of divine revelation or faith? Why, she bore the testimony herself, to herself. There was no other being or institution to do it. Her enemies then denied, and

now deny, her authority; and in no event will it be contended that they were, or are, her witnesses. It was a necessity of nature, as well as an ordinance of God, that she should be her own witness. This was one of her divinely communicated rights, resting on the nature of things, as God had constituted *nature*, as we call it; but be it remembered that what we call "nature," is God's law impressed upon natural things for their security, and not something inherent in the order of things which is independent of his power and will. This right of the Church, then, to bear witness to herself, was one of the attributes of authority communicated to her in her divine organization. When did she lose it? Who stripped her of this divine attribute? Luther, Calvin, and Henry VIII. Indeed! By what authority did they take away this element of her character with which her God had endowed her? They must show a divine command, unmistakably revealed, for such assumption, or else be branded as the usurpers of divine power. This is their position, and no acuteness at framing sophisms, no agility in shifting their ground, will screen them from a conviction, first, by a tribunal of their own selection—nor save them, secondly, from the crime of treason against the divine mission of the Church.

But, in conclusion, this assertion that the Church cannot bear testimony to herself, is a fallacy as old, in spiritual logic, at least, as the Pharisees who confronted the blessed Jesus with the very same sophism of human arrogance—the same folly of the flesh. These old Protestants, as we read in the eighth chapter of St. John's gospel, presented themselves before the divine Founder of the holy Catholic Church, and concluded against his veracity and authority and divine mission in these words:—"The Pharisees, therefore, said to him: Thou givest testimony to thyself; thy testimony is not true. Jesus answered and said to them: Although I give testimony of myself, my testimony is true; for I know whence I came and whither I go; but you know not whence I came and whither I go. You judge according to the *flesh*."

It is now clearly seen that the "vicious circle," as a matter of fact, is first insidious and then untrue; that as a matter of serious logic, it is utterly absurd. And even as a logical puzzle, it is infinitely inferior to the race between Achilles and the tortoise, by which the artists in these efforts at wit think they have demonstrated he could never overtake it, if it had a few feet the start in the race of a thousand. The argument of this famous puzzle is,

"let Achilles run ten times as fast as the tortoise, yet if the tortoise has the start, Achilles will never overtake him. For suppose them to be at first separated by an interval of a thousand feet; when Achilles has run these thousand feet, the tortoise will have got on a hundred; when Achilles has run these hundred, the tortoise will have run ten, and so on forever; therefore, Achilles may run forever without overtaking the tortoise." Now the simplest solution (without reference to art) is, that the phrase "and so on forever" is untrue. And as a fallacy of art, its detection is equally easy. For the term "and so on forever" is carried into the conclusion as an equivalent to an eternity of either time or distance, or both; when no such *fact* is involved, let alone stated, in the premises.

But what will the world gain if the protest against the Church's infallibility, in her office of teaching divine revelation, were a valid protest, in fact and in logic? Nothing. Nothing but an unutterable loss. She would gain the *conclusion* that no man can know from the teachings of any system of religion whether what is taught be absolutely true or absolutely false. Such a conclusion is a loss as ruinous to our hopes and consolations in time, as it is to all the hopes and consolations

of futurity. Why not then let the children of the Church enjoy their undoubted assurance and faith in the teaching of their holy Mother, the Church? At the worst, they are as likely to be right as those who profess to be guided alone by fallible teaching. They can be but in error, reposing on fallibility. In fallible teaching no man can believe with full and unwavering assurance. To assert an undoubted repose and faith in a fallible teacher of divine revelation is surely no other thing than a crude insanity, or a wild fanaticism.

THE END.

670
215
B13
Baine, A. C.
67
AUTHOR
Harmonious Relations betwee
Faith and Reason
TITLE
GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY
BERKELEY, CA 94709